



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2005

No. 145

House of Representatives

The House met at 9:00 a.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Eternal God and Lord of history, each day this Nation seeks Your blessing that we may know the ways that are righteous and be protected from evil.

The revered Abraham Lincoln spoke of the "mystic chords of memory." He was convinced that heroes and heroines of the past inspire people presently to make bold steps into the future.

Thus, Congress makes laws today by building upon the past.

Lord, for Lincoln, the profound obligation and duties of the Constitution were so strong that there is a link of the living with the dead and with the unborn of a new generation.

Fidelity to the Constitution is a guarantee to the future, because the living are determined "that representative government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PALLONE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five 1-minutes on each side.

DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, a debate is brewing in Congress that will have a significant impact on the future of this Nation. There are two clearly defined sides in this debate. On the one hand are fiscal conservatives such as myself who want to cut government spending and rein in the Federal deficit. On the other hand are folks who believe that more government spending is the answer to all our problems, and these folks will raise your taxes to pay for it.

In light of the high cost associated with hurricane relief, our budget's \$35 billion savings package is simply not enough. The good news is that Congress now has the rare opportunity to rein in Federal spending by \$50 billion and reform decades-old programs that are often duplicative and ineffective.

It is disappointing that many of my Democratic colleagues are fighting the Deficit Reduction Act. Even though they complain about the deficit, they would like to increase spending by billions of dollars. These Members have no plan to reduce the deficit. Their only answer is to raise taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the last thing we need is more of the old tax-and-spend mentality. The Deficit Reduction Act gives us an opportunity to streamline our government, reform ineffective programs, cut spending, and provide greater accountability. It is time for this important legislation to pass.

REPUBLICANS ARE NOT ADDRESSING THE DEFICIT

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans tout their budget bill as fiscally responsible, but the American

people should not be deceived. It is nothing more than another attempt to cut taxes for the wealthiest few on the backs of America's college students and America's Medicaid and food stamp recipients.

The cuts House Republicans will attempt to bring to the House floor next week are nothing but cruel. It has only been 2 months, and Republicans have already forgotten about the poverty stricken people affected by Hurricane Katrina.

While Republicans cut \$50 billion in Federal programs, they also give \$70 billion in tax cuts to the wealthiest few. That means the Republican budget bill will increase the deficit by \$20 billion. Again, increase the deficit. And Republicans call themselves fiscally responsible? Well, the American people will be watching next week, and they will not be deceived.

PROTECTING PATIENT PRIVACY

(Mr. MURPHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, nearly all Americans' personal health information remains at some risk. More than one in four health insurance plans and almost one in three care providers have indicated that they experience data security breaches of personal health information.

The problem is that only 43 percent of health care providers comply with Federal laws that protect an unauthorized disclosure of health information. As the U.S. slowly expands its use of electronic health records, Congress needs to shift from the current complaint-driven approach to enforcing privacy standards to proactively defending patients' personal information. Every American should be able to know that their medical records are secure.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H9643

My legislation, H.R. 2234, would keep electronic medical records safe, ensure that patients have access to their own records, and notify them when information is accessed by an unauthorized user, thus reducing risk. Ensuring health data security is important for all Americans to have confidence in their hospital.

I would urge my colleagues to learn more about protecting patient privacy for the 21st century by visiting my Web site at murphy.house.gov.

BROWN STILL EMPLOYED BY DHS

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, it might shock everyone to know that former FEMA Director Michael Brown is still on the government's payroll. Michael Brown is still earning a \$148,000 annual salary.

"Brownie, you're doing a heck of a job."

Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff agreed to extend Mr. Brown's contract for yet another 30 days.

Michael Brown's recent e-mails that have now been made public show he was more interested during the crisis in his dinner reservations and his attire than getting food, water, and medical supplies to those New Orleans residents, and yet he is still getting paid by the taxpayers.

We should not be shocked. This is accountability Bush style, and the only people that get fired by the President are those who tell the truth. Look at what happened with Michael Brown and look at what happened to General Shinseki who told the truth and who was fired.

Mr. Speaker, this administration gives a whole new meaning to job security. We can do better. It is time for new priorities. It is time for a change.

A VICTORY FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, our country has been built by innovative men and women who have devoted their lives to owning their homes and businesses. As a former real estate attorney, I know firsthand that ownership is an important component of the American dream.

In June, the rights of property owners recently came under attack when the Supreme Court issued a decision giving local governments the power to seize private property from one private party and give it to another. By valuing potential tax revenues and economic development over the private rights of American citizens, the court delivered a dangerous decision that misinterprets our Constitution and threatens our core values.

Led by sponsor HENRY BONILLA and Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, the House of Representatives acted last night to restore power to American citizens. By passing the Private Property Rights Protection Act of 2005, Congress voted to ensure property owners truly have control over their homes, businesses, and organizations. This legislation is an important victory for all Americans.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

JUSTIFYING WAR IN IRAQ

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. One of the attempted false justifications for the war in Iraq was that Iraq was trying to get uranium from Niger to make nuclear weapons. This lie and the attempts to justify it are key to understanding not only the Libby indictments but to understanding why we are in Iraq.

Who forged the Niger documents? What role did Italian intelligence have in the forgeries? What role did the White House Iraq group have in falsely promoting the phony nuclear threat? Who forged the Niger documents? Who took us to war on false pretenses, sending thousands of our beloved soldiers to their deaths?

Sign House Resolution 505. Support that, because that requests the President and directs the Secretary of State to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in their possession relating to the White House Iraq group.

TIME TO FORGIVE AND MOVE ON

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there are some people that just cannot seem to get beyond these allegations about the President of the United States lying to us. Over and over we are told the President of the United States lied to us. But I am not sure that that is actually the case. There is evidence. Even Joe Wilson's initial oral report to his superiors indicated some support for that idea that Saddam was trying to get weapons of mass destruction. Perhaps, maybe the President lied to us. Maybe his wife, who reportedly said the same thing, maybe they did lie to us.

Maybe it is because of my Christian background that teaches forgiveness, but I say: In order for this country to move on, it is time to forgive President Bill Clinton if it was a lie and move on.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET PRIORITIES

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, we have the new-found foe, fiscal conservatives on that side of the aisle. They control everything, the House, the White House, the Senate. They have increased the debt of the United States 62 percent in the last 5 years to \$8 trillion, and now they want to cut spending.

Now, what spending are they targeting? Is it the big wasteful spending? No. It is duplicative programs like school lunch and breakfast. I guess those kids are taking two meals. Or student loans. I guess those kids are taking a double load of classes and paying too much. So they will cut \$50 billion, and the next week they are going to cut taxes for those who earn over \$300,000 a year by \$70 billion.

Now, in their world, even though that is a \$20 billion increase in the real deficit, they say, no, that is not an increase in the deficit, because those rich people, why, they are just going to trickle down on the rest of America. They are going to put the rest of us to work, and they are going to increase productivity, and some day that will increase Federal revenues because working people pay taxes, not rich people, in their world. This is a bizarre turn of events here in Washington, D.C., and their cuts and their tax cuts should be rejected.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3057, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 532 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 532

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3057) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution

532 is a traditional standard rule for consideration of the conference report for the fiscal year 2006 Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today appropriates almost \$21 billion. It is an increase of about actually over \$1 billion for operations across the globe. The bill is fiscally sound. It has grown at a small, very small rate, while at the same time I think it is responsive to the needs, not only the national security interests or the foreign policy interests of the United States, but also it is responsive to the needs of millions plagued by disease and famine and disaster throughout the world.

H.R. 3057, for example, Mr. Speaker, bolsters the President's Millennium Challenge Corporation to nearly \$1.8 billion. It is about a quarter of a billion more than last year. This is an expansion of assistance meant to help bring really economic security and the rule of law to some of the world's poorest countries by insisting on American aid going to countries where there is transparency for the aid that we send, not corruption.

□ 0915

It is an important initiative.

The Millennium Challenge provides assistance through a competitive selection process to developing nations that are genuinely in the path of political and economic reforms in three areas: ruling justly, in other words, treating their people decently; investing in people; and fostering economic freedom. Economic development genuinely succeeds when it is linked to free market economic and democratic principles and policies and where governments are committed to implementing reform measures when they are needed to achieve such goals.

Two years ago in the State of the Union address, President Bush announced the President's emergency plan for AIDS relief. It is the largest international health initiative in history initiated by a single government to address one disease. This legislation shows Congress's continued support to the fight against HIV/AIDS. It includes \$2.8 billion, an increase of over \$600 million over last year to continue the fight against HIV/AIDS, as well as tuberculosis and malaria.

The resolve of this Congress to help all those across the globe to fight this disease is strong and serious, as is the commitment of the President of the United States. In addition to funding, the Federal Government enlists the expertise of agencies, including the Food and Drug Administration, which assures that the medicines we send to the areas most affected by this horrible pandemic are safe and effective to help those with HIV/AIDS.

In other foreign assistance, H.R. 3057 funds the Andean Counterdrug Initia-

tive at the President's request, \$735 million, \$9 million more than in 2005. Economic growth in the area since the start of Plan Colombia, for example, is proof that the assistance that we have provided Colombia has made a difference in that country.

I visited Colombia in April of last year. It was a great honor for me to do so. I have tens of thousands of distinguished constituents, very hard-working, honorable people from Colombia.

It was a pleasure to visit that country and to witness, Mr. Speaker, the extraordinary progress that the Colombian Government and the Colombian people have made against the narcoterrorists. They constantly reiterate, they did so during my visit and they have done so since and I know they have done so to countless colleagues in this House, they reiterate their gratitude to this Congress for the important assistance that the American people, the taxpayers of this country, through their Congress have provided them and continue to do so in their fight against narcoterrorism.

Now, we must not take progress in the Andean region for granted. If the United States turns its back on the region, a scenario may very well ensue that would require greater U.S. investment at a time when we have significant responsibilities worldwide.

The underlying legislation provides also \$2.5 billion for military and economic assistance to Israel. We have to continue to ensure that our friends and allies remain secure; and, of course, we have no better friend, no better ally than Israel. We are committed to doing everything we can to see that Israel is safe and secure within its borders as it continues to move in this very difficult era toward the achievement of a lasting peace with all of its neighbors.

The conference report funds the President's request to fund the foreign military financing for Egypt at \$1.3 billion. It provides almost half a billion dollars for economic assistance to Egypt, including assistance set to help with political reform programs and education assistance. Of course, that is a very, very important initiative that this country has been involved in for decades now.

I would like to thank Chairman LEWIS, who has worked very hard again, and Chairman KOLBE for their extraordinary leadership in moving this bill forward for our consideration today. I obviously support the conference report. I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying legislation, the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, lately when Americans turn on the news at

night, they do not see the government that they recognize. They hear about a war in the Middle East gone wrong, and they see suffering people left to fend for themselves in times of crisis. They learn more and more about a White House under siege, and they are forced to recognize the ugly truth that many of their congressional leaders are entangled in a web of corruption.

While the criticism is justified and the concerns are real, the failures do not define America. It is important to remember that in difficult times, especially in difficult times, we must always keep close, in spite of the challenges at home and abroad, and that no other nation has shined the light of freedom and liberty as brightly as we have here in our country. No nation in history has given so much and asked for so little in return.

That romantic and powerful notion of America as a force for good in a troubled world strikes at the very heart of what it means to be an American. It is that spirit which drives us as a Nation to create a government as good as its people, and today we take one step in helping to restore that feeling in America to embody the ideal of what we hold dear. It is a bill that will help Americans recognize their government once again.

The foreign operations bill funds a number of different foreign assistance agencies and international organizations and, as such, has become both a critical and effective tool for this democracy to spread democratic values and concern for human rights around the world. This is legislation that the American people can take great pride in.

After all, today you will generously give \$2.82 billion to some of our noblest callings, such as easing the suffering of those around the world stricken by HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria, and particularly in Africa. \$14 billion that Americans earned this year will be used to give foreign assistance.

These moneys will also help economic development in countries like Israel, Egypt, Afghanistan, Indonesia, Tibet, Colombia, and a number of other Eastern Bloc countries now struggling to become functioning democracies.

It further spends \$1.6 billion to help fund many of the well-intentioned international financial institutions which the United States participates in, such as the World Bank, the African Development Fund, and the voluntary U.N. programs such as UNICEF and the U.N. Development Program. These American dollars will assist those struggling societies to build a better life for themselves and their families.

What we often fail to recognize is that foreign operations also help us here at home. The spending in the bill directly benefits our domestic economy. Through our many foreign assistance programs, we export American goods, American services and agricultural products all over the world. That means jobs for American families and a

brighter future for families across the world.

Of course, as with many complex pieces of legislation, I have some concerns with the conference report. Key among them is the Bush administration's insistence on maintaining a global gag rule which prevents critical family planning and health services aid from reaching the U.S. health clinics in underdeveloped and overpopulated countries where abortion counseling services are provided.

Clinics in overpopulated regions are not even allowed to take a public pro-choice position, and the United Nations fund for Population Assistance Program, which provides critical family planning services abroad, has been unfairly targeted by such administration policy.

The UNFPA does not provide abortion services, but the program has been repeatedly denied critical U.S. funding by the Bush administration under the gag rule. As a result, thousands of women in overpopulated developing nations are without the health care and family planning resources each of us takes for granted here in America.

Thankfully, this conference report provides \$34 million in funding for this important program. But antichoice House and Senate conferees stripped the language which would protect the funding from the gag rule, and as a result that money will most likely never reach those it was intended to help.

Despite these attempts to politicize the considerable aid this Nation provides abroad, this legislation, on the whole, serves an unqualified good for the people all over the world.

I would submit, though, that through the money we spend here today on foreign ops, we do a better job of spreading universal values of democracy and liberty and freedom than with the hundreds of billions of dollars we have spent on the war in Iraq.

By helping to improve the quality of life for people all over the world, we export the seeds of our American Dream; and by investing in international organizations that open markets, create trade, foster economic development and promote democracy, we create a rising tide that truly lifts all boats.

This is the way America spreads its values most effectively. By serving the world community and investing as both a partner and leader in the global community, we exemplify what it truly means to be American; and as a result, we provide a living example that the America we have long known is still standing tall.

These programs effectively address global challenges at their root source and seek to overcome those challenges the right way, by fostering hope and opportunity, rather than fear and hostility. They are the best ambassadors of the American spirit that we could ever hope to export. After all, what better way is there for us to spread democracy, freedom, and social justice than through the methods that have

proven time and time again to actually work.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN).

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman KOLBE, Ranking Member Lowey, and their respective staffs for consistently working in a bipartisan fashion and trying year after year to bring before the House a bill that all Members can support.

For those of us who care in particular about the contributions made by the United States in reducing global poverty and hunger, increasing educational opportunities, access to health care and food security in some of the poorest places on this Earth, we very much appreciate the time and the effort that they invest in making sure that this bill responds to these needs and priorities.

I must express, however, Mr. Speaker, my regret that the final conference report did not include the Leahy-McConnell language dealing with the paramilitary demobilization taking place in Colombia. I recognize the language in the conference report is the result of some compromise, but it appears to me that the majority of compromising had to be done on the Senate side.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about news reports that demobilized paramilitary groups are regrouping into Mafia-like criminal organizations. New paramilitary groups seem to be springing up like daisies and their ranks are often made up of newly demobilized paramilitary troops.

Like all Members of Congress who follow Colombia, I want the demobilization process to work. I want it to succeed. But the process is not helped when the Congress or the administration turns a blind eye to serious failings in its implementation, as has been done over and over and over again.

For these reasons, I believe that the certification provision on Colombia's demobilization process in this bill, even though it is watered down, I think is important and needs to be faithfully implemented.

Last night during the Rules Committee hearing, I was very reassured when Chairman KOLBE told me that his committee would be vigilant in monitoring the demobilization of Colombia's paramilitary organizations and in overseeing the implementation of the certification conditions contained in the bill.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have often raised on the floor of this House my concerns about the long-standing ties between Colombia's armed forces and paramilitary forces and drug traffickers. I have constantly been told by the administration, by the Colombian Government, and even by some Members of this House, that these allegations also simply are not true.

Well, last week, on October 28, the New York Times reported how the top two directors of Colombia's intelligence agency, commonly called their secret police, have been forced to resign because the attorney general's office has finally begun an investigation into how the 7,100-member agency has been engaged in a money-making operation to sell intelligence and surveillance equipment to right-wing paramilitary groups.

Mr. Speaker, I will include the New York Times article in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned by a new wave of threats, disappearances and murders of Colombian trade unionists, human rights defenders, legal advocates and community leaders which appears to be under way.

□ 0930

The violence in Colombia appears to be sharply escalating once again. I would like to mention in particular the murder of Mr. Orlando Valencia, an Afro-Colombian community leader who was forcibly captured off the street by paramilitary forces shortly after he was first briefly detained and then released by the Colombian police on October 15, which shows you the collaboration between the security forces and paramilitaries. His tortured and mutilated body was found a few days later along the side of a local road.

At the time of his disappearance, I wrote to our embassy in Bogota, asking them to do all they could to find Mr. Valencia before he was killed; and I am still waiting for a response from our embassy to that letter.

So let me say to those who continue to champion billions of dollars in additional aid to the Colombian military and security forces, please pay attention not only to the spokespeople of the Colombian government but to the realities in that country. We should be more concerned. For all that we have invested in that country, we should expect better.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York for allowing me the time to express these concerns. I support the rule, and I will support the bill.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 28, 2005]

TWO TOP DIRECTORS LEAVE COLOMBIA'S
SECRET POLICE AS SCANDAL MOUNTS
(By Juan Forero)

BOGOTÁ, COLOMBIA, Oct. 27.—The top two directors of Colombia's secret police were forced out this week as the government investigated allegations that the agency was mounting a money-making operation to sell intelligence and surveillance equipment to right-wing death squads.

The scandal at the agency, the Administrative Department of Security, comes as human rights groups and some legislators have exposed heightened paramilitary activity, including infiltrations of Congress and the attorney general's office. The paramilitaries also continue trafficking in cocaine, despite disarmament talks that underpin President Álvaro Uribe's effort to pacify Colombia with billions in American aid.

The 7,100-member intelligence agency has long been dogged by allegations that its

agents have worked with paramilitaries of the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia, an illegal antiguerrilla organization that the State Department has branded a terrorist group. But the latest scandal has been especially explosive, coming amid international criticism that the government has been overly generous with paramilitaries who disarm by treating them leniently in prosecutions.

On Tuesday, after consultations with Mr. Uribe, Jorge Noguera, the director of the agency, resigned and its sub-director, José Miguel Narváez, was dismissed.

The agency's internal affairs unit and the attorney general's office are investigating whether the Special Intelligence Group, controlled by Enrique Ariza, a close ally of Mr. Noguera, had been planning to sell phone-tapping equipment to Javier Montañas, one of several powerful paramilitary commanders who could then use the system to monitor police and military activity.

Mr. Noguera denied the accusations, calling them part of a smear campaign.

Mr. Narváez said in an interview that he and Mr. Noguera were not involved in a conspiracy with the militias. But he said there were agents at the agency "who veered away from their mission and may have committed crimes."

The allegations are particularly grave because they add to a string of revelations of paramilitary influence in everything from local governments and the health care system to provincial lotteries. Indeed, a former official at the intelligence agency, Rafael García, has been under investigation for having erased computerized case files containing information on paramilitaries and drug traffickers.

"This is more serious because this is not just having sources on the inside and knowing when they're coming against you," said Sergio Jaramillo, a former Defense Ministry official, referring to infiltration of the intelligence agency. "It is something closer, having active help."

A political scientist who closely studies the paramilitaries, Mauricio Romero, said the disclosures also showed that the paramilitaries were "not playing clean" in peace talks.

"It would be understandable if they were at war with the state," said Mr. Romero, a professor at Rosario University in Bogotá. "The fact that there is infiltration and that they are mounting a parallel intelligence system is a security problem not just for the state, but for society."

Though the paramilitaries have demobilized thousands of fighters, they continue to wreak havoc.

On Saturday, Hernando Cadavid, who owned a flower farm next to Mr. Uribe's ranch in northern Colombia, was dragged from his farm and hacked to death with machetes by former paramilitaries. Investigators are trying to determine if the order came from Diego Fernando Murillo, a paramilitary boss recently jailed on Mr. Uribe's orders.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we are also concerned about Colombia, and we are concerned about increased assistance from the terrorist network throughout the world, the Iranians, Chavez in Venezuela, Castro's Cuba. We are concerned about their support for the narcoterrorists in Colombia, and that is why it is so important to provide assistance to the democratically elected government of Colombia.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Two things. Is the gentleman saying that the President of Venezuela is a terrorist?

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am saying that it is a dictatorship. It is a dictatorship, a dictatorship that supports the regime in Iran publicly; a dictatorship, the regime in Caracas. The first foreign head of State to visit Saddam Hussein while Saddam Hussein was in power after the Gulf War of the 1990s was the President of Venezuela. So, yes, I am concerned about the President of Venezuela's links to terrorism and his assistance to the FARC guerrillas in Colombia.

One of the reasons why we continue to help and assist the democratically elected government of Colombia, elected by an overwhelming majority of the Colombian people, is because they face multiple challenges. That is one of the reasons why, in a bipartisan fashion, this Congress continues to help the democratically elected government.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will further yield, I appreciate his concerns about the violence by the FARC. I would also just appreciate it if he would also be concerned about the fact that we are supporting the Colombian military and security forces and they continue to be linked to right-wing paramilitary forces which commit crimes.

All I am simply saying is that we have certification language, we should enforce it and not continuously waive it because we want to continue to let the money flow. If we stand for human rights, then we need to put our actions where our rhetoric is, and we have not been doing that in Colombia.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, we have certification language. We do not condone in any way terrorism from any source in Colombia. We have consistently had safeguards in our legislation to make sure that our assistance is not used by terrorists of any sort in Colombia, but I think that we have to keep our eye on the ball here, and that is that there is a democratically elected government challenged by narcoterrorists, heavily funded because of their trade in narcotics, their narcotrafficking, and that that government, that democratically elected government, is a friend of this country and merits our continued support.

So I am honestly very pleased that, in a bipartisan fashion, this Congress continues to support the democratically elected government of Colombia; and that is one of the great foreign policy initiatives, bipartisan foreign policy initiatives, by the way, that this country is engaged in, which is very connected to the security of this country in addition to the foreign policy objectives of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, there is much in this bill to support, and I rise in support of the rule and the bill. This is a bill which demonstrates America's capacity to be sensitive to the world, America's willingness to feed the hungry, to help those who are depressed and oppressed all around the world.

The heart of America is open to people everywhere. That is why it is such a tragedy that, while we simultaneously will pass this bill today, our country is involved in action in Iraq that is undermining all the goodwill that America creates with this bill. What an irony it is that we are here talking about the needs of people all over the globe and, at the same time, we are alienating people all over the globe by pursuing a war in Iraq, a country that did not attack us, based on false information from an administration that should have known better.

So, yes, we ought to support this rule and we ought to support the bill, because the word that ought to go out, far and wide, about the United States is that we care about suffering people, that we want to find a way of lifting up people everywhere, that we want to try to find a way of making this a better world. But, as we do that, we also need to be consistent. We need to remember that we are simultaneously pursuing a path in Iraq that is wrong. We need to take a new direction there so that we can bring America's aspirations to help the world in line with our policy everywhere.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Rules Committee.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the legislation itself.

I would like to begin by congratulating my very good friend from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and my friend from New York (Ms. Lowey) for working in a bipartisan way to ensure that we could get this conference report to the floor.

I also want to congratulate, of course, the leadership of the full committee. I see the gentleman from Wisconsin here and Chairman LEWIS, who I know have worked long and hard on these issues.

It is great that we are able to continue down this road of getting our work done when it comes to appropriations. That has been a high priority that Chairman LEWIS has established; and, obviously, what we are going through today is evidence of that.

I want to especially, as we look at what is a multi-billion-dollar piece of legislation designed to ensure the national security of the United States of America and our interests around the world, I would like to talk about a tiny

bit of money that is in here. It is a lot of money to me, it is a lot of money to us as individuals, it is \$1 million, but in the big scheme of things, if you look at a \$20 billion package, the \$1 million is relatively small.

It has to do with funding for something known as the House Democracy Assistance Commission. This is a very, very important initiative that was launched by Speaker HASTERT and Minority Leader PELOSI to put us on the road towards assisting, from this institution, emerging parliaments around the world.

One of the things that we found in the aftermath of Iraq is that there has been really a tremendous expansion of democracy. We know that in this hemisphere, and I heard the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Florida having an exchange about this hemisphere, and I cannot help but think about the fact that we need to herald, herald the fact that, as the Summit of the Americas is taking place in Argentina at the moment, there are 34 democratically elected leaders in this hemisphere, and that is something that is unprecedented, unprecedented. We never in the history of the world have seen this kind of expansion of pluralism in this hemisphere, but it is also taking place in other parts of the world. Hence, we put together this Democracy Assistance Commission.

I was very honored that the Speaker asked me to chair this, and I am joined by my very good friend from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) who has worked on this. This is an idea that goes, frankly, all the way back to our former colleague, Doug Bereuter, who worked on this initiative.

What we are doing is, in the coming months, we are going to see members of parliaments from these new democracies, new parliaments coming to the United States and spending time in State capitals, working in congressional district offices, dealing with the wide range of issues that Members of the House of Representatives face. They are going to do that for 1 week.

Then, for a week, they are going to be coming to Washington, DC, and they are going to have an opportunity to focus attention on these very important issues of committee establishment, of budget process, oversight of the executive branch, things that we have a tendency to take for granted that these new democracies are just beginning to learn about.

One of those countries is the newest democracy on the face of the earth. It happens to be a country that just gained its independence 6 years ago from Indonesia: East Timor, a nation established in 1999. We also are going to include Indonesia. We are going to be including Kenya, the Republic of Georgia, Macedonia. Those are going to be the first five countries that we are going to include. So we will have roughly 10 parliamentarians from each of those five countries come to the

United States and expend time and effort learning about this process, which we have a tendency to take for granted.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is working very hard on this commission. We appreciate all the work that he has put into it, and we also appreciate the fact that he understands the importance of making sure that it succeeds.

This is all part of our quest to win the global war on terror. As has been pointed out time and time again, as we see the expansion, Mr. Speaker, of these democracies, we are in a position where we now have an opportunity to create a chance for people in these countries to succeed without resorting to terrible, terrible things.

So I congratulate my friends for this overall bill. I congratulate them and the bipartisan spirit in dealing with this appropriations process. I support the rule, and I look forward for voting for final passage on this very important conference report.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for the fiscal year 2006 foreign operations conference report, which provides further foreign assistance to the Republic of Armenia, including \$75 million in economic assistance. I would like to thank the House Appropriations Committee for its continued support of both Armenia and resolving the humanitarian situation in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Foreign Operations Subcommittee Chairman KOLBE and Ranking Democrat NITA LOWEY realize how important these funds are to Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh, and I would like to thank them for their continued support.

I would also like to thank my friend and co-chair of the Armenian Caucus, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), for his key support as a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, it is very important that this House continue to recognize the plight of the victims of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. The conference committee included \$3 million in humanitarian assistance to Nagorno-Karabakh. While the United States does not officially recognize the State of Nagorno-Karabakh, this assistance shows that the United States supports Nagorno-Karabakh as an Armenian enclave that needs our continued help.

It is also important to point out that the conference report maintains military assistance parity between Armenia and Azerbaijan, providing \$5 million allocated to each country. By allocating equal levels of military and security assistance to both nations, the U.S. Government will preserve its credibility as an impartial and leading mediator in the continuing sensitive peace negotiations for the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. Given the ongoing

Azerbaijani blockades and threats to renew military aggression against Armenia and Karabakh, it is critically important that the administration continue to promote balanced short- and long-term policies that elevate regional cooperation and reduce the risk of conflict in the south Caucasus region.

Again, let me thank the members of the Appropriations Committee for their continued support for Armenia.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to a great leader in this House, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule supporting the conference report for Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. It is an example of Congress demonstrating the ability to fund our national and international priorities in a fiscally responsible way, and I come to this floor to extol its virtues and urge all of my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

This legislation will fund the Nation's priorities in a meaningful way, addressing the AIDS pandemic, bringing innovative reforms to our foreign assistance programs and, of ultimate significance, supporting the global war on terror.

But specifically with regard to the internal mechanics of this legislation, I am particularly moved by the leadership of Chairman JERRY LEWIS of the Appropriations Committee and subcommittee chairman JIM KOLBE who, in an effort to ensure that this legislation was brought to this floor not only on time but on budget, are in the midst of an extraordinary effort to amend the Budget Act to embrace a new road map that will bring not only this bill but all of the appropriations to the \$843 billion level embraced by this Congress this spring.

Many of us have expressed concerns in recent days that three of the four preceding conference reports that came to the floor did not conform precisely with the details of that spring-adopted budget.

□ 0945

In response to that, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee shared with us and with other Members the road map to help us to achieve what will be, in a historic manner, a real cut to nonsecurity discretionary spending before Congress adjourns this year.

But in an effort to go one step further, the Appropriations Committee began the process this week of amending that road map into the Budget Act itself.

It is my understanding that the Budget Committee as well as many fiscal hawks in the Republican majority

have been moved by that leadership and see it as an example of the energetic, principled, executive renewed leadership in the Appropriations Committee under Chairman JERRY LEWIS.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I urge all of my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill. I rise to give credit where credit is due, to Chairman JERRY LEWIS and Subcommittee Chairman JIM KOLBE, for a job well done, proving once again it is possible to fund the Nation's priorities on time, on budget, in a generous, but fiscally responsible, way.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of the conference report, the Foreign Operations and Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act of 2006. At this time, I want to commend the chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee for the very fair and bipartisan manner in which he has brought this bill forward. I will save my comments on the substance of the conference report for the general debate.

However, I do want to make clear that we had a tough job taking this bill through conference. The very low initial allocation in the House was compounded by a low conference allocation that cut the President's request by \$2 billion. I would have preferred to increase funding levels for many of the important programs contained in this bill, including refugee assistance.

However, I do think this conference report represents a fair, bipartisan, bicameral compromise. The chairman conducted this process in an inclusive manner, and I do commend him for it. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support the conference report on H.R. 3057.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time and permitting me to speak on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and of the underlying legislation. I want to highlight the \$200 million that has been set aside for safe drinking water.

I must acknowledge not just the leadership of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), but the special interests of the Senate majority leader, BILL FRIST, with whom I have been working on efforts to increase our commitment to provide sanitation and safe drinking water around the world, a United States priority that we have undertaken together with the United Nations; but it is one where we have not yet backed that up with dollars and with an overall strategy.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this bill is an important step towards meet-

ing that obligation. I am pleased that next week it appears as we will be voting on legislation, the Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act, which will suggest that this will be a cornerstone in our foreign aid strategy.

At any given time, one-half of the people in the world who are sick are sick needlessly from waterborne diseases; and before I finish the 3 minutes that the gentlewoman has kindly allocated to me, more than 10 children will die from waterborne disease.

But the programs in this bill are more than just humanitarian efforts to reduce human suffering. As valuable as they are, they are cost-effective investments in shared prosperity, collective security, and a common future.

I hope that next year we will make it possible for the subcommittee to do its job easily and that the United States is not ranked 21st out of 22 donor countries in terms of how much we invest in ending global poverty compared to the size of our economy.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, additionally, that we are able to correct one area that is of deep concern to me, the loss of \$50 million for the African Union Mission in Darfur, cut just at the point where security is getting worse, when the African Union is coming under attack, and the innocent people in Darfur are most in need of protection.

It troubles me deeply. However, overall I think the job that has been done by the subcommittee in fighting for our priorities and particularly in the renewed investment in safe drinking water and sanitation is to be commended. It will have a transformational effect, even this small amount. Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that if Americans would allocate just what we give each year for elective cosmetic surgery, or the Europeans would invest what they spend on perfume, we could meet the targets that the United States and the United Nations have set to reduce the scourge of unsafe drinking water and lack of sanitation.

I appreciate the work that is here. I look forward to supporting the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman KOLBE and Ranking Member LOWEY for increasing the amount of money that has been put into the alternative development program in Colombia. It is a program that gets people away from growing coca into growing alternative crops. And I stand in support of the rule on this bill.

I am a returned Peace Corps volunteer from Colombia and very much interested in building the capacity of local people to handle their own issues. If there is anything that we have learned from the Iraq war, it is the necessity to build local capacity for host country nationals to be able to run their own government and their own programs.

And if you have a lot of people that are displaced, meaning they have no place to live, no jobs, no schools, no infrastructure to support them, you have a lot of problems. So what you need to do is provide abilities for them to have, in the rural areas, good economic opportunity. You do that by providing a base of what we call alternative development of programs that will keep them economically viable and thus not pressured into growing illicit crops and things like that.

The committee in the House marked this with good money. The Senate raised it. And the conference committee brought it a little bit down, \$5.5 million over last year's level. I really want to commend the committee for doing that.

I think, frankly, that we need to, as a Congress, really address how much money gets to these countries, rather than just gets to K Street and lobbyists that are doing reports and doing studies of countries, rather than really helping the money get down to the people. And this is one program that focuses on local issues and NGOs, non-governmental organizations, rather than multimillion dollar contracts for U.S. contractors.

Building capacities is absolutely essential to survivability of a country. Now, one concern I have is that the report contains \$20 million for demobilization activities from an unspecified account. I think it is great that we are helping with the demobilization of the paramilitaries and the FARC and other kinds of insurgents, terrorists in a sense; but I want to make sure that that demobilization money is not taken from the alternative crop money.

I would appreciate if the chairman in his remarks could, perhaps for the record, respond to what conditions have been put on that demobilization money when they decide what account to take it from.

Again, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member, and I really appreciate their efforts to look for how to make a saner and smarter world to live in, rather than just sticking to the old adage that we are going to give money to K Street and let them decide what are the priorities abroad.

Anything we can do to build the capacities of local countries to sustain themselves will make this world a much safer and saner place to live.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to respond to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and his comments about the demobilization funds that we have in the bill for Colombia.

The legislation provides that the funds can come from any place in the Act. I cannot guarantee where the administration might ask for those funds

to come from. However, the law would require that they consult with us and notify the subcommittee. And I can assure you that if they were to ask to take funds out of a program that is working and working well, such as the alternative development program in Colombia, we would object to such a request.

So it is very broad on where the money can come from. We have no assurances, I might add to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), that they are even going to request this money at all. But if they do, we will be watching very carefully as to where it would come from and make sure it is the appropriate place.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I just want the gentleman to know I share the concerns of the chairman. I believe that we can have far greater impact in Colombia by investing in alternative livelihoods rather than forced eradication.

Mr. Speaker, I would be very reluctant to see funding for demobilization programs come at the expense of any alternative development programs, and I look forward to working with the chairman to ensure that this just does not happen.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for raising these concerns.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank each and every distinguished Member of the House who has spoken this morning on this legislation. Obviously, this is, appropriately so, a tremendous amount, really a consensus, which is pleasing to see support for what we are doing as a Congress and as a government, as a Nation in this legislation.

I want to take one final moment, if I may, to explain a point that I made in response to a question to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) when I said that it is my belief that the Government of Venezuela is a dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak a second or a minute to explain why. Democracy, in order for it to exist, requires two fundamental pillars or legitimacies; the legitimacy of origin, which is obtained through free and fair elections, and the Government of Venezuela was elected. So it obviously had the legitimacy of origin.

But then I believe that for a government to be democratic, it has to have another form of legitimacy, which is legitimacy in its conduct in the process of governing. And if a government, even if democratically elected, represses the opposition, persecutes the opposition, represses the press, for example the free press, in my view, it loses that other legitimacy which is required, the legitimacy of conduct for a democracy to be a democracy.

Mr. Speaker, so I am convinced that the Government of Venezuela has lost its democratic legitimacy, and it is not a democracy. So I appreciate the opportunity to explain why I believe, as I stated before, that it is at this moment a dictatorship.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for his extraordinary work once again in bringing forward this legislation. He is one of the people that I greatly admire in this House.

□ 1000

I urge all of our colleagues to support what we are doing, the very important step we are taking for our foreign policy interests and great humanitarian causes today in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include tabular and extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 3057.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3057, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 532, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 3057) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 532, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 2, 2005, at page H9499.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased this morning to be able to bring before my colleagues in the House of Representatives the fiscal year 2006 Foreign Operations Appropriations Conference Report for the bill H.R. 3057.

There is no doubt that the conferees had a difficult challenge this year,

working with an overall funding allocation that is almost \$2 billion below the fiscal year 2006 request. This is nearly 10 percent less than the President asked for. Nonetheless, the conferees took on the challenge of making the hard choices necessary to meet budgetary realities while funding this country's top foreign policy priorities at responsible levels, levels that fulfill our foreign policy objectives.

The conference report continues strong and active oversight of the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars consistent with the mandate given to us by the United States taxpayers and the leadership of this committee and the Congress.

The conference report continues the Appropriations Committee's pursuit of accountability for the expenditure of tax dollars, in particular our foreign assistance program expenditures. The oversight of our primary agencies—State Department, Treasury Department and USAID—includes quarterly reporting of expenditures, consultation on major programmatic changes and limitation on expenditures until conditions on congressional notifications are met.

The conference agreement also establishes for the first time an independent inspector general for the Export Import Bank.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a very quick summary of the bill. Let me turn now to some of the highlights that are contained in the conference report.

First, with regard to overall funding, the fiscal year 2006 budget request for the foreign operations account or appropriations bill was \$22.8 billion. As I already mentioned, the conference report funds our foreign assistance portfolio at \$20.9 billion; \$1.9 billion below what the President had asked for but \$1.4 billion over the fiscal year 2005 conference agreement.

Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief. The conference report includes \$2.8 million for the third year of the Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief. Here we are actually above the President's request by \$268 million. This number is \$629 million over the fiscal year 2005 level.

The conference report includes not less than \$450 million, twice the amount requested by the President, for the U.S. contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

The Millennium Challenge Corporation, or MCC. This agreement funds the MCC at \$1.77 billion, \$270 million or 18 percent above the \$1.5 billion provided in fiscal year 2005. We are, however, and this needs to be noted, significantly below the \$3 billion requested by the President for this year.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a strong supporter of the Millennium Challenge Corporation. I was there when the President announced the idea for it. I helped draft the legislation which ultimately ended up in our bill. I am a big believer in this new concept of delivering foreign assistance. But we did

have limitations, and I think that what we have done is a responsible way for it to proceed and make sure that we have adequate funding to continue and expand the work of the Millennium Challenge Corporation.

The increase that we have for the MCC and the conference report comes because we recognize that the White House's top priority, and they communicated this with us, was the Millennium Challenge Corporation. But, as I said, our budgetary constraints left us with little ability to fully fund this important initiative.

Supporting the global war on terror. The agreement provides significant increases in our security assistance and anti-narcotics programs abroad for our allies in the war on terror. This includes fully funding the request for \$2.3 billion for Israel and \$1.8 billion for Egypt in economic and security assistance, and \$300 million for Pakistan and military assistance.

Additionally, over \$1.2 billion have been provided to the anti-narcotics and law enforcement accounts, \$155 million above last year's levels. The conferees recognize that the illegal drug industry is not only a domestic issue facing the United States but one that funds international terrorism and organized crime, thereby threatening our borders.

Afghanistan. The agreement dramatically increases economic and counternarcotics/law enforcement assistance for Afghanistan at \$665 million. That is \$350 million above last year's level. This conference agreement fully funds the \$430 million request for Economic Support Funds for Afghanistan, an increase of \$205 million over the 2005 level. It provides \$235 million for police and counternarcotics programs.

Importantly, the conference report includes new language that limits expenditure of about half of the ESF funds until the Secretary of State certifies to the committee that the government of Afghanistan at both the national and provincial levels is fully cooperating with the United States on narcotics eradication and interdiction efforts.

Iraq. In the case of Iraq, the conference agreement provides \$61 million in ESF funds. The fiscal year 2006 request was for \$458.5 from a variety of accounts to support activities in Iraq. This obviously is a very significant difference from what was requested. However, the committee noted that more than \$3.5 billion of the \$18.4 billion that was appropriated in 2003 for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund remains unobligated. The conferees did

not think it was responsible to direct new taxpayer resources to Iraq at this time.

The conferees expect the administration to fund the remainder of its request for Iraq from the unobligated portions of the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund, and we are convinced that the administration has the flexibility to do just that.

West Bank and Gaza. This agreement fully funds the request of \$150 million for the West Bank and Gaza program, an increase of \$75 million over the 2005 level, and retains the fiscal year 2005 prohibitions and restrictions on the expenditure of those funds, including the requirements for a GAO audit of U.S. assistance.

There is no request for direct cash assistance for the Palestinian Authority, and nothing in this conference report or accompanying statement of the managers provides for such assistance.

MDB oversight. The agreement includes a provision addressing anti-corruption measures for the World Bank and other reform provisions for all the multi-lateral development banks. It is our hope that these provisions will lead to greater transparency, less corruption, and more effective operations for our multi-lateral contributions to these institutions.

The Global Environmental Facility, or GEF. The agreement includes \$80 million for the Global Environmental Facility. That is \$27 million below the request, but it is a full \$80 million more than was in the House-passed bill. The conferees were pleased to see that in the intervening months the Global Environmental Fund has agreed to establish a performance-based allocation system for the disbursement of funds, as it had committed to do in 2002.

Next year, my subcommittee will continue to conduct oversight of the GEF to monitor how the allocation system is implemented, but our inability to fund the full amount is simply a budgetary one, not because of any transgression on the part of the GEF.

There are many other items in the conference agreement that I do not have time to go into in detail, but let me just briefly touch on them.

\$322 million for the Peace Corps. That is \$5 million above last year.

\$4.3 billion total for USAID, \$121 million above the request and \$93 million below last year's enacted level.

\$440 million for bilateral international family planning programs, of which \$34 million goes to the UNFPA.

The conference agreement does, however, retain current law on restriction and prohibitions on assistance, which I know will please some and make others very unhappy.

The conference report does not include the \$100 million for conflict response funds that had been requested by the administration. We believe this is something that can be handled through reallocation of funds.

Let me close by thanking my ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for her continued cooperation and commitment in producing a bipartisan conference agreement. I say with all the sincerity in the world, it is both an honor and pleasure to work with a legislator as dedicated and hardworking as the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

I also want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and my chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), for the support that both of them have given in bringing the product which we bring to you today.

I want to thank the other members of the subcommittee, the minority side as well as the majority side, who served on this conference and helped us in our deliberations and were such active members of all of the hearings that we held during the course of this year. I think our conference agreement reflects the spirit of cooperation that has been the hallmark of this subcommittee.

Finally, let me extend my thanks to the staff of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. On the House side, Alice Hogans, Rodney Bent, Rob Blair, Lori Maes, Betsy Phillips, Nisha Desai, as well as Sean Mulvaney from my staff and Beth Tritter from the gentlewoman from New York's (Mrs. LOWEY) staff.

On the Senate side, I want to thank Paul Grove, Tom Hawkins, Tim Rieser, Jennifer Park, Bob Lester and Harry Christy for the work they did in bringing this bill to where we are today.

This is a specially poignant moment for me and for the subcommittee as it will be the last time that Rodney Bent and Sean Mulvaney will be on the floor for one of our bills before they leave for different opportunities. While we wish them well in their new pursuits, they will be sorely missed by me and by the staff of the subcommittee. I thank them for what they have done through the years to help support the foreign policy of the United States.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their indulgence here. I thank them for the support they have given us. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the conference report.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS- EXPORT FINANCING- AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2006 (H.R. 3057)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
TITLE I - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE						
EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES						
Subsidy appropriation.....	59,322	186,500	125,000	125,000	100,000	+40,678
Administrative expenses.....	72,614	73,200	68,200	73,200	73,200	+586
Inspector General.....	---	1,000	---	1,000	1,000	+1,000
Negative subsidy.....	-33,000	-35,000	-35,000	-35,000	-35,000	-2,000
Total, Export-Import Bank of the United States..	98,936	225,700	158,200	164,200	139,200	+40,264
OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION						
Noncredit account:						
Administrative expenses.....	42,542	42,274	42,274	42,274	42,274	-268
Insurance fees and other offsetting collections...	-278,000	-240,000	-240,000	-240,000	-240,000	+38,000
Subsidy appropriation.....	23,808	20,276	20,276	20,276	20,276	-3,532
Total, Overseas Private Investment Corporation..	-211,650	-177,450	-177,450	-177,450	-177,450	+34,200
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
Trade and development agency.....	51,088	48,900	50,900	50,900	50,900	-188
Total, title I, Export and investment assistance	-61,626	97,150	31,650	37,650	12,650	+74,276
TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
United States Agency for International Development						
Child survival and health programs fund.....	1,537,600	1,251,500	1,497,000	1,659,000	1,585,000	+47,400
(Transfer out).....	(-6,000)	---	(-6,000)	---	(-6,000)	---
Development assistance.....	1,448,320	1,103,233	1,460,000	1,675,000	1,524,000	+75,680
(Transfer out).....	(-21,000)	(-21,000)	(-21,000)	(-21,000)	(-21,000)	---
(Transfer out).....	(-24,000)	---	---	---	---	(+24,000)
International disaster assistance.....	367,040	655,500	356,000	400,000	365,000	-2,040
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
International disaster and famine assistance						
(Emergency).....	17,856	---	---	---	---	-17,856
(By transfer emergency appropriations).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
(By transfer) (P.L. 108-106).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-324).....	100,000	---	---	---	---	-100,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	90,000	---	---	---	---	-90,000
Subtotal, Disaster assistance.....	574,896	655,500	356,000	400,000	365,000	-209,896
Transition Initiatives.....	48,608	325,000	50,000	50,000	40,000	-8,608
Development Credit Authority:						
(By transfer).....	(21,000)	(21,000)	(21,000)	(21,000)	(21,000)	---
Administrative expenses.....	7,936	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	+64
Subtotal, Development assistance.....	3,617,360	3,343,233	3,371,000	3,792,000	3,522,000	-95,360
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund.....						
Operating expenses of the U.S. Agency for International Development.....	613,056	680,735	630,000	620,000	630,000	+16,944
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
(By transfer).....	(6,000)	---	(6,000)	---	(6,000)	---
(By transfer).....	(24,000)	---	---	---	---	(-24,000)
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106) (Transfer to U.S. AID Office of Inspector General).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	24,400	---	---	---	---	-24,400
Subtotal, USAID.....	637,456	680,735	630,000	620,000	630,000	-7,456
Capital Investment Fund.....	58,528	77,700	77,700	77,700	70,000	+11,472
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Capital investment fund.....	58,528	77,700	77,700	77,700	70,000	+11,472

FOREIGN OPERATIONS- EXPORT FINANCING- AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2006 (H.R. 3057)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Operating expenses of the U.S. Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General....						
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106)(By transfer)	34,720	36,000	36,000	36,000	36,000	+1,280
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	2,500	---	---	---	---	-2,500
Subtotal, Operating expenses.....	37,220	36,000	36,000	36,000	36,000	-1,220
Total, USAID.....	4,393,064	4,179,368	4,156,400	4,567,400	4,299,700	-93,364
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance						
Economic support fund:						
Israel.....	357,120	240,000	240,000	240,000	240,000	-117,120
Egypt.....	530,720	495,000	495,000	495,000	495,000	-35,720
Other.....	1,574,800	2,301,375	1,823,525	2,296,375	1,899,000	+324,200
Economic support fund (P.L. 108-106).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
(By transfer emergency).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
(Transfer out).....	(-150,000)	---	---	(-10,000)	(-5,000)	(+145,000)
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	1,433,600	---	---	---	---	-1,433,600
Iraqi Relief and Reconstruction Fund (by transfer)	---	---	---	---	(5,000)	(+5,000)
Subtotal, Economic support fund.....	3,896,240	3,036,375	2,558,525	3,031,375	2,634,000	-1,262,240
International Fund for Ireland.....	18,352	---	13,500	---	13,500	-4,852
Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States....	393,427	382,000	357,000	395,000	361,000	-32,427
Assistance for the Independent States of the former Soviet Union.....	555,520	482,000	477,000	565,000	514,000	-41,520
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	70,000	---	---	---	---	-70,000
Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction Fund:						
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 109-13).....	656,000	---	---	---	---	-656,000
(Transfer out emergency) (P.L. 109-13).....	(-48,500)	---	---	---	---	(+48,500)
Total, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance.....	5,589,539	3,900,375	3,406,025	3,991,375	3,522,500	-2,067,039
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Inter-American Foundation						
Appropriation.....	17,856	17,826	19,500	20,000	19,500	+1,644
African Development Foundation						
Appropriation.....	18,848	18,850	20,500	25,000	23,000	+4,152
Peace Corps						
Appropriation.....	317,440	345,000	325,000	320,000	322,000	+4,560
Millenium Challenge Corporation						
Appropriation.....	1,488,000	3,000,000	1,750,000	1,800,000	1,770,000	+282,000
Department of State						
Global HIV/AIDS initiative.....	1,373,920	1,970,000	1,920,000	2,020,000	1,995,000	+621,080
Democracy Fund.....	---	---	---	95,000	95,000	+95,000
(Transfer out).....	---	---	---	(-80,000)	---	---
International narcotics control and law enforcement....	326,189	523,874	442,400	523,874	477,200	+151,011
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	620,000	---	---	---	---	-620,000
Subtotal, Narcotics control.....	946,189	523,874	442,400	523,874	477,200	-468,989
Andean Counterdrug Initiative.....	725,152	734,500	734,500	734,500	734,500	+9,348
(By transfer).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Migration and refugee assistance.....	763,840	892,770	790,720	900,000	791,000	+27,160
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	120,400	---	---	---	---	-120,400
United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund.....	29,760	40,000	30,000	40,000	30,000	+240
Nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs.....	398,784	440,100	400,350	445,100	410,100	+11,316
(By transfer).....	---	---	---	---	---	---

FOREIGN OPERATIONS- EXPORT FINANCING- AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2006 (H.R. 3057)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	24,600	---	---	---	---	-24,600
Subtotal, Nonproliferation.....	423,384	440,100	400,350	445,100	410,100	-13,284
Conflict response fund.....	---	100,000	---	74,000	---	---
Subtotal, Department of State.....	4,382,645	4,701,244	4,317,970	4,832,474	4,532,800	+150,155
Department of the Treasury						
International Affairs Technical Assistance.....	18,848	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	+1,152
Debt restructuring.....	99,200	99,750	65,000	99,750	65,000	-34,200
Subtotal, Department of the Treasury.....	118,048	119,750	85,000	119,750	85,000	-33,048
=====						
Total, title II, Bilateral economic assistance..	16,325,440	16,282,413	14,080,395	15,675,999	14,574,500	-1,750,940
Appropriations.....	(13,166,084)	(16,282,413)	(14,080,395)	(15,675,999)	(14,574,500)	(+1,408,416)
Emergency appropriations.....	(3,159,356)	---	---	---	---	(-3,159,356)
(By transfer).....	(51,000)	(21,000)	(27,000)	(21,000)	(32,000)	(-19,000)
(By transfer emergency appropriations).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
(Transfer out).....	(-201,000)	(-21,000)	(-27,000)	(-111,000)	(-32,000)	(+169,000)
(Transfer out emergency appropriations).....	(-48,500)	---	---	---	---	(+48,500)
=====						
TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE						
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
International Military Education and Training.....	89,012	86,744	86,744	86,744	86,744	-2,268
Foreign Military Financing Program:						
Grants:						
Israel.....	2,202,240	2,280,000	2,280,000	2,280,000	2,280,000	+77,760
Egypt.....	1,289,600	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	+10,400
Other.....	1,253,392	1,008,600	862,300	1,023,600	920,000	-333,392
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106) (by transfer).....	(150,000)	---	---	---	---	(-150,000)
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	250,000	---	---	---	---	-250,000
Subtotal, Grants.....	4,995,232	4,588,600	4,442,300	4,603,600	4,500,000	-495,232
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(40,000)	(42,500)	(41,600)	(42,500)	(41,600)	(+1,600)
Total, Foreign Military Financing.....	4,995,232	4,588,600	4,442,300	4,603,600	4,500,000	-495,232
Peacekeeping operations.....	103,168	195,800	177,800	195,800	175,000	+71,832
(Emergency appropriation).....	74,400	---	---	---	---	-74,400
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Omnibus Appropriations (transfer from DoD) (P.L. 108-447) (Sec. 117).....	(79,360)	---	---	---	---	(-79,360)
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	240,000	---	---	---	---	-240,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13) (by transfer emergency).....	(50,000)	---	---	---	---	(-50,000)
Subtotal, Peacekeeping operations.....	417,568	195,800	177,800	195,800	175,000	-242,568
=====						
Total, title III, Military assistance.....	5,501,812	4,871,144	4,706,844	4,886,144	4,761,744	-740,068
Appropriations.....	(4,937,412)	(4,871,144)	(4,706,844)	(4,886,144)	(4,761,744)	(-175,668)
Emergency appropriations.....	(564,400)	---	---	---	---	(-564,400)
(By transfer).....	(229,360)	---	---	---	---	(-229,360)
(Transfer out).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(40,000)	(42,500)	(41,600)	(42,500)	(41,600)	(+1,600)
=====						
TITLE IV - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
International Financial Institutions						
World Bank Group						
Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:						
Global Environment Facility.....	106,640	107,500	---	107,500	80,000	-26,640

FOREIGN OPERATIONS- EXPORT FINANCING- AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2006 (H.R. 3057)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Contribution to the International Development Association.....	843,200	950,000	950,000	900,000	950,000	+106,800
Contribution to Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency.....	---	1,742	1,742	1,300	1,300	+1,300
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)....	---	(8,127)	(8,127)	(8,127)	(8,127)	(+8,127)
Total, World Bank Group.....	949,840	1,059,242	951,742	1,008,800	1,031,300	+81,460
Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank:						
Contribution to the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund.....	10,912	1,742	1,742	3,742	1,742	-9,170
Inter-American Investment Corporation.....	---	1,742	1,742	1,500	1,742	+1,742
Contribution to the Asian Development Bank:						
Contribution to the Asian Development Fund.....	99,200	115,250	115,250	100,000	100,000	+800
Contribution to the African Development Bank:						
Paid-in capital.....	4,067	5,638	5,638	3,638	3,638	-429
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)....	---	(88,334)	(88,334)	(88,334)	(88,334)	(+88,334)
Contribution to the African Development Fund.....	105,152	135,700	135,700	135,700	135,700	+30,548
Total, African Development Bank.....	109,219	141,338	141,338	139,338	139,338	+30,119
Contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development:						
Paid-in capital.....	35,148	1,016	1,016	1,016	1,016	-34,132
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)....	(121,997)	(2,250)	(2,250)	(2,250)	(2,250)	(-119,747)
Contribution to the International Fund for Agricultural Development.....	14,880	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	+120
Total, International Financial Institutions.....	1,219,199	1,335,330	1,227,830	1,269,396	1,290,138	+70,939
International Organizations and Programs						
Appropriation.....	325,767	281,908	328,958	330,000	329,458	+3,691
Total, title IV, Multilateral economic assistance.....	1,544,966	1,617,238	1,556,788	1,599,396	1,619,596	+74,630
(Limitation on callable capital subscript).....	(121,997)	(98,711)	(98,711)	(98,711)	(98,711)	(-23,286)
TITLE V - GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Expenditure transfer (Sec. 542).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13) (rescission)...	-1,000,000	---	---	---	---	+1,000,000
Rescission.....	---	---	-64,000	---	---	---
Sec. 6083 unobligated balances.....	---	---	---	-100,000	---	---
Sec. 6084 Security in Asia.....	---	---	---	25,000	10,000	+10,000
Sec. 6093 Iraqi Relief and Reconstruction fund (by transfer).....	---	---	---	(10,000)	---	---
Sec. 6098 U.S. Canada Alaska Railroad Commission (rescission).....	---	---	---	-2,000	---	---
Foreign Military financing program (Sec. 6113) (by transfer).....	---	---	---	(50,000)	---	---
Conflict Response fund (Sec. 6113) (transfer out)....	---	---	---	(-50,000)	---	---
Child Survival and Health programs (Sec. 6118) (by transfer).....	---	---	---	(100,000)	---	---
Economic Support fund (Sec. 6118) (transfer out).....	---	---	---	(-100,000)	---	---
(Sec. 577).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Sudan (Sec. 569).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Total, title V, General Provisions.....	-1,000,000	---	-64,000	-77,000	10,000	+1,010,000
Appropriations.....	---	---	---	(-75,000)	(10,000)	(+10,000)
Rescissions.....	-1,000,000	---	-64,000	-2,000	---	+1,000,000
(By transfer).....	---	---	---	(160,000)	---	---
(Transfer out).....	---	---	---	(-150,000)	---	---
Grand total.....	22,310,592	22,867,945	20,311,677	22,122,189	20,978,490	-1,332,102
Appropriations.....	(19,586,836)	(22,867,945)	(20,375,677)	(22,124,189)	(20,978,490)	(+1,391,654)
Emergency appropriations.....	(3,723,756)	---	---	---	---	(-3,723,756)
Contingent emergency appropriations.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Rescissions.....	-1,000,000	---	-64,000	-2,000	---	+1,000,000
(By transfer).....	(280,360)	(21,000)	(27,000)	(181,000)	(32,000)	(-248,360)
(By transfer emergency appropriations).....	(50,000)	---	---	---	---	(-50,000)
(Transfer out).....	(-201,000)	(-21,000)	(-27,000)	(-261,000)	(-32,000)	(+169,000)
(Transfer out emergency appropriations).....	(-48,500)	---	---	---	---	(+48,500)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(40,000)	(42,500)	(41,600)	(42,500)	(41,600)	(+1,600)
(Limitation on callable capital subscript).....	(121,997)	(98,711)	(98,711)	(98,711)	(98,711)	(-23,286)
(Emergency Supplemental (P.L. 108-106)).....	(3,725,256)	---	---	---	---	(-3,725,256)

FOREIGN OPERATIONS- EXPORT FINANCING- AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS - FY 2006 (H.R. 3057)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP						
Scorekeeping adjustments:						
Czech loans.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106).....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	-3,725,256	---	---	---	---	+3,725,256
Contingent emergency appropriations.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Adjustment to balance with CBO's ATB estimate.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Total, adjustments.....	-3,725,256	---	---	---	---	+3,725,256

Total (including adjustments).....	18,585,336	22,867,945	20,311,677	22,122,189	20,978,490	+2,393,154
Amounts in this bill.....	(22,310,592)	(22,867,945)	(20,311,677)	(22,122,189)	(20,978,490)	(-1,332,102)
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	(-3,725,256)	---	---	---	---	(+3,725,256)
Prior year outlays.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
=====						
Total mandatory and discretionary.....	18,585,336	22,867,945	20,311,677	22,122,189	20,978,490	+2,393,154
Mandatory.....	(42,500)	(41,700)	(41,700)	(41,700)	(41,700)	(-800)
Discretionary.....	(18,542,836)	(22,826,245)	(20,269,977)	(22,080,489)	(20,936,790)	(+2,393,954)
=====						
RECAP BY FUNCTION						
Mandatory.....	42,500	41,700	41,700	41,700	41,700	-800
Prior year outlays.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Mandatory.....	42,500	41,700	41,700	41,700	41,700	-800

Discretionary.....	18,542,836	22,826,245	20,269,977	22,080,489	20,936,790	+2,393,954
Prior year outlays.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Discretionary.....	18,542,836	22,826,245	20,269,977	22,080,489	20,936,790	+2,393,954
=====						
Grand total, Mandatory and Discretionary.....	18,585,336	22,867,945	20,311,677	22,122,189	20,978,490	+2,393,154
=====						
DISCRETIONARY 302(b) ALLOCATION						
302(b) allocation.....	19,386,000	---	20,270,000	31,671,000	20,937,000	+1,551,000
Over/under allocation.....	-843,164	22,826,245	-23	-9,590,511	-210	+842,954

Conference Report with Outlays
(Amounts in thousands)

	Budget Authority					Outlays				
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference
11600	TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE									
11700	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT									
11800	United States Agency for International Development									
11900	1,537,600	1,251,500	1,497,000	1,659,000	1,585,000	154,000	330,000	459,000	532,000	517,000
12000	(-6,000)		(-6,000)		(-6,000)	(-1,000)		(-1,000)		1,900,150
12100	1,448,320	1,103,233	1,460,000	1,675,000	1,524,000	145,000	88,000	117,000	134,000	122,000
12200	(-21,000)	(-21,000)	(-21,000)	(-21,000)	(-21,000)	(-5,000)	(-2,000)	(-2,000)	(-2,000)	122,000
12300	(-24,000)									123,000
12400	367,040	655,500	356,000	400,000	365,000	92,000	247,000	89,000	100,000	91,000
12500										124,000
12600										125,000
12700	17,856					5,000				12,600
12800										12,700
12900										12,800
13000	100,000					18,000				12,900
13010	90,000					5,000				13,000
13100	574,896	655,500	356,000	400,000	365,000	120,000	247,000	89,000	100,000	13,010
13200	48,608	325,000	50,000	50,000	40,000	18,000	41,000	19,000	19,000	13,100
13300	(21,000)	(21,000)	(21,000)	(21,000)	(21,000)	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	15,000
13400	7,936	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	13,300
13500										3,000
13600	3,617,360	3,343,233	3,371,000	3,792,000	3,522,000	440,000	713,000	690,000	792,000	6,000
13700										13,500
13800	42,500	41,700	41,700	41,700	41,700	43,000	42,000	42,000	42,000	13,600
13900	613,056	680,735	630,000	620,000	630,000	460,000	511,000	473,000	465,000	13,700
14000	(6,000)		(6,000)		(6,000)	5,000		5,000		14,000
14100	(24,000)					18,000				14,100
14200										14,200
14300										14,300
14400										14,400
14500	24,400					4,000				14,500
14510										14,510
14600	637,456	680,735	630,000	620,000	630,000	487,000	511,000	478,000	465,000	14,600

Conference Report with Outlays
(Amounts in thousands)

	Budget Authority			Outlays			
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	FY 2006 Request	
14700 Capital Investment Fund.....	58,528	77,700	77,700	77,700	70,000	62,000	56,000 14700 150
14800 Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106).....	---	---	---	---	---	---	14800 150
14900 Subtotal, Capital investment fund.....	58,528	77,700	77,700	77,700	70,000	62,000	56,000 14900
15000 Operating expenses of the U.S. Agency for Inter- national Development Office of Inspector General.....	34,720	36,000	36,000	36,000	36,000	27,000	15000
15200 Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106) (by transfer).....	---	---	---	---	---	---	15200 150
15210 Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	2,500	---	---	---	---	---	15210 150
15300 Subtotal, Operating expenses.....	37,220	36,000	36,000	36,000	36,000	27,000	27,000 15300
15400 Total, USAID.....	4,393,064	4,179,368	4,156,400	4,567,400	4,299,700	1,355,000	1,354,000 15400
15500 Other Bilateral Economic Assistance							15500
15600 Economic support fund:							15600
15700 Israel.....	357,120	240,000	240,000	240,000	240,000	240,000	240,000 15700 150
15800 Egypt.....	530,720	495,000	495,000	495,000	495,000	113,000	113,000 15800 150
15900 Other.....	1,574,800	2,301,375	1,823,525	2,296,375	1,899,000	527,000	435,000 15900 150
16000 Economic support fund (P.L. 108-106)							16000 150
16100 (By transfer emergency).....	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
16200 (Transfer out).....	(-150,000)	---	---	(-10,000)	(-5,000)	---	---
16210 Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	1,433,600	---	---	---	---	---	16210 150
16250 Iraqi Relief and Reconstruction Fund (by transfer)							16250 150
16300 Subtotal, Economic support fund.....	3,896,240	3,036,375	2,558,525	3,031,375	2,634,000	880,000	788,000 16300
16400 International Fund for Ireland.....	18,352	---	13,500	---	13,500	---	3,000 16400 150
16500 Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States.....	393,427	382,000	367,000	395,000	361,000	57,000	54,000 16500 150
16600 Assistance for the Independent States of the former Soviet Union.....	555,520	482,000	477,000	565,000	514,000	72,000	85,000 16600
16710 Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	70,000	---	---	---	---	---	---
17210 Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction Fund:							17210 150
17215 Emergency supplemental (P.L. 109-13).....	656,000	---	---	---	---	---	---
17220 (Transfer out emergency) (P.L. 109-13).....	(-48,500)	---	---	---	---	---	---
17300 Total, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance.....	5,589,539	3,900,375	3,406,025	3,991,375	3,522,500	1,009,000	922,000 17300

Conference Report with Outlays
(Amounts in thousands)

	Budget Authority					Outlays					
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	
17400	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES										
17500	Inter-American Foundation										
17600	17,856	17,826	19,500	20,000	19,500	7,000	7,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	
17700	African Development Foundation										
17800	18,848	18,850	20,500	25,000	23,000	7,000	7,000	8,000	10,000	9,000	
17900	Peace Corps										
18000	317,440	345,000	325,000	320,000	322,000	248,000	289,000	253,000	250,000	251,000	
18200	Millenium Challenge Corporation										
18300	1,488,000	3,000,000	1,750,000	1,800,000	1,770,000	149,000	300,000	175,000	180,000	177,000	
18400	Department of State										
18500	1,373,920	1,970,000	1,920,000	2,020,000	1,995,000	138,000	287,000	372,000	337,000	380,000	
18600	---	---	---	95,000	95,000	---	---	---	38,000	24,000	
18675	---	---	---	(-80,000)	---	---	---	---	-32,000	---	
18700	326,189	523,874	442,400	523,874	477,200	78,000	125,000	106,000	125,000	114,000	
18800	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	
18810	620,000	---	---	---	---	31,000	---	---	---	---	
18900	946,189	523,874	442,400	523,874	477,200	109,000	125,000	108,000	125,000	114,000	
19000	Andean Counterdrug Initiative										
19100	725,152	734,500	734,500	734,500	734,500	72,000	73,000	73,000	73,000	73,000	
19200	763,840	892,770	790,720	900,000	791,000	527,000	616,000	546,000	621,000	546,000	
19210	120,400	---	---	---	---	17,000	---	---	---	---	
19300	United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund										
19400	29,760	40,000	30,000	40,000	30,000	3,000	4,000	3,000	4,000	3,000	
19500	Nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs										
19600	398,784	440,100	400,350	445,100	410,100	219,000	242,000	220,000	245,000	19500	
19700	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	
19800	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	
19810	24,600	---	---	---	---	7,000	---	---	---	---	
19900	423,384	440,100	400,350	445,100	410,100	226,000	242,000	220,000	245,000	226,000	

Conference Report with Outlays
(Amounts in thousands)

	Budget Authority					Outlays					
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	
20000 Conflict response fund.....	--	100,000	--	74,000	--	--	38,000	--	28,000	--	20000 150
20100 Subtotal, Department of State.....	4,382,645	4,701,244	4,317,970	4,832,474	4,532,800	1,092,000	1,385,000	1,320,000	1,429,000	1,366,000 20100	
20200 Department of the Treasury										20200	
20300 International Affairs Technical Assistance.....	18,848	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000 20300 150	
20400 Debt restructuring.....	99,200	99,750	65,000	99,750	65,000	42,000	10,000	7,000	10,000	7,000 20400 150	
20500 Subtotal, Department of the Treasury.....	118,048	119,750	85,000	119,750	85,000	44,000	12,000	9,000	12,000	9,000 20500	
20600 Total, title II, Bilateral economic assistance.....	16,325,440	16,282,413	14,080,395	15,675,999	14,574,500	3,615,000	4,344,000	3,972,000	4,300,000	4,096,000 20600	
20700 Appropriations.....	(13,166,084)	(16,282,413)	(14,080,395)	(15,675,999)	(14,574,500)	3,398,000	4,343,000	3,967,000	4,331,000	4,091,000 20700	
20800 Emergency appropriations.....	(3,159,356)	--	--	--	--	236,000	--	--	--	-- 20800	
20900 (By transfer).....	--	(21,000)	(27,000)	(21,000)	(32,000)	26,000	3,000	8,000	3,000	8,000 20900	
21000 (By transfer emergency appropriations).....	(51,000)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-- 21000	
21100 (Transfer out).....	(-201,000)	(-21,000)	(-27,000)	(-111,000)	(-32,000)	-40,000	-2,000	-3,000	-34,000	-3,000 21100	
21200 (Transfer out emergency appropriations).....	(-48,500)	--	--	--	--	-5,000	--	--	--	-- 21200	

Conference Report with Outlays
(Amounts in thousands)

		Budget Authority					Outlays				
		FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference
21300	TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE										21300
21400	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT										21400
21500	International Military Education and Training.....										
21600	Foreign Military Financing Program:										
21700	Grants:										
21800	Israel.....	2,202,240	2,280,000	2,280,000	2,280,000	2,280,000	2,202,000	2,280,000	2,280,000	2,280,000	2,280,000
21900	Egypt.....	1,289,600	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	854,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
22000	Other.....	1,253,392	1,008,600	862,300	1,023,600	920,000	121,000	193,000	164,000	196,000	215,000
22100	Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106) (by										
22200	transfer).....	(150,000)	---	---	---	---	15,000	---	---	---	---
22300	Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)	250,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
22400	Subtotal, Grants.....	4,995,232	4,588,600	4,442,300	4,603,600	4,500,000	3,192,000	3,573,000	3,544,000	3,576,000	3,585,000
22500	(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(40,000)	(42,500)	(41,600)	(42,500)	(41,600)	37,000	40,000	39,000	40,000	---
22600	Total, Foreign Military Financing.....	4,955,232	4,588,600	4,442,300	4,603,600	4,500,000	3,229,000	3,613,000	3,583,000	3,616,000	3,595,000
22800	Peacekeeping operations.....										
22900	(Emergency appropriation).....	103,168	195,800	177,800	195,800	175,000	60,000	114,000	103,000	114,000	102,000
23000	Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106)	74,400	---	---	---	---	44,000	---	---	---	---
23100	Omnibus Appropriations (transfer from DoD)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
23200	(P.L. 108-447) (Sec. 117).....	(79,360)	---	---	---	---	46,000	---	---	---	---
23210	Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)	240,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
23215	Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13) (by						---	---	---	---	---
23217	transfer emergency).....	(50,000)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
23300	Subtotal, Peacekeeping operations.....	417,568	195,800	177,800	195,800	175,000	150,000	114,000	103,000	114,000	102,000
23400	Total, title III, Military assistance.....	5,501,812	4,871,144	4,706,844	4,886,144	4,761,744	3,421,000	3,768,000	3,727,000	3,771,000	3,738,000
23500	Appropriations.....	(4,937,412)	(4,871,144)	(4,706,844)	(4,886,144)	(4,761,744)	3,279,000	3,728,000	3,688,000	3,731,000	3,738,000
23600	Emergency appropriations.....	(564,400)	---	---	---	---	44,000	---	---	---	---
23700	(By transfer).....	(229,360)	---	---	---	---	61,000	---	---	---	---
23800	(Transfer out).....	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
23900	(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(40,000)	(42,500)	(41,600)	(42,500)	(41,600)	37,000	40,000	39,000	40,000	---

	Budget Authority				Outlays					
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference
27600										
International Organizations and Programs										
27700 Appropriation	325,767	281,908	328,958	330,000	329,458	298,000	257,000	299,000	300,000	299,000
27800										
Total, title IV, Multilateral economic assistance	1,544,966	1,617,238	1,556,788	1,599,396	1,619,596	424,000	389,000	415,000	422,000	421,000
27900	(121,997)	(98,711)	(98,711)	(98,711)	(98,711)	---	---	---	---	---
28100 (Limitation on callable capital subscipt)										
28200										
28300										
28400										
28500										
28600										
28700										
28800										
28900										
29000										
29100										
29200										
29300										
29400										
29500										
29600										
29700										
29800										
29900										
30000										
30100										
30200										
30300										
30400										
30500										
30600										
30700										
30800										
30900										
31000										
31100										
31200										
31300										
31400										
31500										
31600										
31700										
31800										
31900										
32000										
32100										
32200										
32300										
32400										
32500										
32600										
32700										
32800										
32900										
33000										
33100										
33200										
33300										
33400										
33500										
33600										
33700										
33800										
33900										
34000										
34100				</						

[illegible]

Conference Report with Outlays
(Amounts in thousands)

	Budget Authority					Outlays				
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference
TITLE V - GENERAL PROVISIONS										
28200										28200
28300 Expenditure transfer (Sec. 542).....	---	---	---	---	---	---	63,000	45,000	---	---
28310 Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13) (rescission).....	-1,000,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
28315 Rescission.....	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
28322 Sec. 6083 unobligated balances.....	---	---	-64,000	---	---	---	---	-4,000	---	---
28325 Sec. 6084 Security in Asia.....	---	---	---	-100,000	---	---	---	---	-24,000	---
28327 Sec. 6093 Iraqi Relief and Reconstruction fund.....	---	---	---	25,000	10,000	---	---	---	5,000	2,000
28328 (by transfer).....	---	---	---	(10,000)	---	---	---	---	---	28327
28330 Sec. 6098 U.S. Canada Alaska Railroad Commission.....	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	28330
28335 (rescission).....	---	---	---	-2,000	---	---	---	---	-2,000	---
28340 Foreign Military financing program (Sec. 6113).....	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	28340
28342 (by transfer).....	---	---	---	(50,000)	---	---	---	---	10,000	---
28344 Conflict Response fund (Sec. 6113) (transfer out).....	---	---	---	(-50,000)	---	---	---	---	-19,000	---
28350 Child Survival and Health programs (Sec. 6118).....	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	28350
28352 (by transfer).....	---	---	---	(100,000)	---	---	---	---	---	28352
28354 Economic Support fund (Sec. 6118) (transfer out).....	---	---	---	(-100,000)	---	---	---	---	-23,000	---
28356 (Sec. 577).....	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	28354
28360 Sudan (Sec. 569).....	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	45,000
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
28390 Total, title V, General Provisions.....	-1,000,000	---	-64,000	-77,000	10,000	---	63,000	41,000	-53,000	52,000
28392 Appropriations.....	---	---	---	(-75,000)	(10,000)	---	---	45,000	-19,000	52,000
28393 Rescissions.....	---	---	-64,000	-2,000	---	---	---	-4,000	-2,000	---
28394 (By transfer).....	---	---	---	(160,000)	---	---	---	---	10,000	---
28396 (Transfer out).....	---	---	---	(-150,000)	---	---	---	---	-42,000	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
28400 Grand total.....	22,310,592	22,867,945	20,311,677	22,122,189	20,978,490	7,263,000	8,441,000	8,013,000	8,303,000	8,164,000
28500 Appropriations.....	(19,586,836)	(22,867,945)	(20,375,677)	(22,124,189)	(20,978,490)	6,904,000	8,400,000	7,973,000	8,328,000	8,159,000
28600 Emergency appropriations.....	(3,723,756)	---	---	---	---	280,000	---	---	---	---
28700 Contingent emergency appropriations.....	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	28700
28750 Rescissions.....	-1,000,000	---	-64,000	-2,000	---	---	---	-4,000	-2,000	---
28800 (By transfer).....	(280,360)	(21,000)	(27,000)	(181,000)	(32,000)	87,000	3,000	8,000	13,000	8,000
28900 (By transfer emergency appropriations).....	(50,000)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	28900
29000 (Transfer out).....	(-201,000)	(-21,000)	(-27,000)	(-261,000)	(-32,000)	-40,000	-2,000	-3,000	-76,000	-3,000
29100 (Transfer out emergency appropriations).....	(-48,500)	---	---	---	---	-5,000	---	---	---	29100
29200 (Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(40,000)	(42,500)	(41,600)	(42,500)	(41,600)	---	40,000	39,000	40,000	---
29300 (Limitation on callable capital subscripts).....	(121,997)	(98,711)	(98,711)	(98,711)	(98,711)	---	---	---	---	29300
29320 (Emergency Supplemental (P.L. 108-106)).....	(3,725,256)	---	---	---	---	275,000	---	---	---	29320

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP											
	Budget Authority					Outlays					
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	
29590											
Scorekeeping adjustments:											
29700											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											
29800											

Conference Report with Outlays
(Amounts in thousands)

	Budget Authority			Outlays		
	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference
DISCRETIONARY 302(b) ALLOCATION						
31800						31800
32100 302(b) allocation.....	19,386,000	---	20,270,000	31,671,000	20,937,000	25,080,000
32300 Over/under allocation.....	-843,164	22,826,245	-23	-9,590,511	-210	-6,158,000
						133,000

DISCRETIONARY 302(b) ALLOCATION

31800 32100 302(b) allocation..... 19,386,000 --- 20,270,000 31,671,000 20,937,000 25,080,000 150

32300 Over/under allocation..... -843,164 22,826,245 -23 -9,590,511 -210 -6,158,000 133,000 32300

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report; and I urge my colleagues to support it. I want to thank Chairman KOLBE and our colleagues in the Senate for working with me to craft what I believe represents a good bipartisan and bicameral compromise.

This bill demonstrates the commitment of Congress to our Nation's foreign assistance programs and puts foreign assistance where it should be, alongside diplomacy and defense as a pillar of U.S. national security strategy.

In light of our conference allocation, which cuts nearly \$2 billion from the President's request, we have put together a very good bill.

□ 1015

While I would have liked to see us maintain the Senate's level of funding for HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria, I am pleased that we have been able to increase funding by \$125 million above the House level and \$268 million above the President's request, including \$450 million for the Global Fund.

I am also pleased that the conference agreement provides \$440 million for bilateral international family planning programs and \$34 million for the UNFPA. I am disappointed, however, that we could not retain commonsense provisions passed by the Senate that would have repealed the global gag rule and modified the Kemp-Kasten restriction. These provisions would have helped our programs be more responsive to the need for family planning assistance around the world.

I appreciate that the conference report includes increases over the request, the House-passed level and the fiscal year 2005 level for Development Assistance, including a \$65 million increase in funding for basic education. Since Chairman KOLBE and I began working together, we have quadrupled funding for basic education, and I am delighted that the Senate agreed to include the House-passed level for this valuable priority.

The agreement fully funds our commitments to Israel and other Middle Eastern countries and provides increases for programs designed to mitigate ongoing conflicts. I am pleased that we retained the Obey amendment earmarking assistance for democracy and education programs in Egypt. We must use every tool at our disposal to encourage the government of Egypt to make greater strides in reforming its political process, and I think this bill sends that message.

I am greatly concerned about the impact of the October 6 earthquake on the people of Pakistan, and I think it important that we stand by Pakistan in this time of need. While this bill does not contain new funds for earthquake relief, I appreciate the inclusion

of language in the Statement of Managers recognizing the need for additional funds and setting forth the expectation that some of the \$600 million provided in this bill may be reprogrammed to meet relief and reconstruction needs.

I do feel that the bill has a few shortcomings. One is the funding for the Global Environmental Facility. Since the GEF recently adopted the management and transparency reforms advocated by the United States, I do feel we should have done our part by fully funding the fiscal year 2006 request. However, I understand that budgetary constraints limited our contribution to \$80 million, and I hope that we can strive for full funding in fiscal year 2007.

I also regret that, while we fulfilled the administration's request for Sudan, the bill does not contain funding added by Senator CORZINE on the Senate floor for the African Union peacekeeping mission in Darfur. I hope that the administration will seek these funds at the earliest possible moment and any subsequent request for funding or reprogramming in this fiscal year.

Finally, I am pleased that we were able to achieve compromise language placing restrictions on military assistance for Indonesia and paramilitary demobilization assistance for Colombia. While I would have preferred the more robust Senate language on these issues, I believe the compromises we have reached address the concerns of all interested parties.

Finally, I want to thank again Chairman KOLBE for his hard work on this bill, his commitment on this bill. I really deeply appreciate the close working relationship which we have enjoyed throughout the years. It has really been a pleasure for me to work on these very important issues in this bill with him.

I also want to thank the members of my subcommittee for their commitment to the issues that we worked so hard on included in this bill.

I want to thank Chairman LEWIS and Ranking Member OBEY for their commitment and their cooperation in working on this bill and, of course, the staff.

Chairman KOLBE has an outstanding staff. Betsy Phillips, Alice Hogans, Rodney Bent, Rob Blair, Lori Maes, and Sean Mulvaney have been wonderful partners in this process; and we will miss a few of them who are moving on. Good luck to them.

Of course, our outstanding minority staff, it is always a pleasure for me to work with Nisha Desai and Beth Tritter. I thank them for their hard work as well.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this bill; but I want to make a few observations, some of which I find to be quite ironic in the process.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee. He has done his usual workman-like job. He is a first-rate public servant, and I appreciate the bipartisan and nonideological tone that he brings to his work. That is fully appropriate to the nature of the bill that he brings to this House.

But I must confess a sense of irony. This Congress has already voted to provide \$1.2 trillion in tax cuts for millionaires over the next decade. It has voted to provide more than \$250 billion in spending for the war in Iraq; and yet, there are a number of Members of this body who begrudge the fact that in this bill you would find roughly \$15 billion to be spent on what I would call the tools of peace and mercy: peace because I think economic assistance to the poverty stricken parts of the world help create conditions that avoid war, and mercy because I think a good portion of this bill could be called the most important pro-life bill that we vote on each year.

Literally in the hour that it took to deal with the rule, you will have had several hundred children in this world die, and that is no accident. A lot of it occurs simply because of the negligence of the developed world, and I would like to think that that would rapidly change; but I do not expect to see it, unfortunately.

The New York Times wrote an editorial this morning suggesting that this bill be vetoed because this bill provides \$2 billion or so less than the President supposedly requested to attack poverty problems in the Third World. I agree with the concerns expressed in that New York Times editorial; and I would say, imagine how different the world would be if instead of spending \$250 billion on the dumbest war in American history, at least since the War of 1812, imagine how changed the world would be if we led the world and provided just 10 percent that amount each year to see that by the end of the next decade we could deliver clean drinking water to every single human being on this planet.

Imagine how the world's attitude toward the United States would change. I doubt very much that you would see some of the poll responses that we see these days where a majority of people in all too many countries consider America to be a threat, unfortunately, rather than a friend. I think the view of the United States is unjustified; but nonetheless, that is the way a lot of people think around the world, and it is in very large part because we put so much money into an action like Iraq and put so little money into helping people achieve the basic necessities of life.

But I do not think that this bill can be blamed for the fact that we fall

short of the President's budget for economic and anti-poverty help. What I do not understand is why anybody takes the President's budget seriously on this, because the President knew full well that while he was asking for this money, he knew full well that his allies in Congress would never allow that kind of an increase in foreign assistance as long as they were gleefully cutting aid to children under Medicaid, as long as they were gleefully about to take 300,000 American families off food stamps, as long as they were gleefully cutting children off the SCHIP welfare rolls in this country. They knew that public opinion would not tolerate providing large increases even for starving people around the world.

So in that sense, I think the New York Times editorial is aiming at the wrong target. It is not the fault of the gentleman from Arizona or the gentlewoman from New York. It is not the fault of this committee that these misbegotten priorities are being carried out. It is the fault of the Republican Party leadership in this country, led by President Bush and the leadership in this House.

I want to say one other thing. We saw yesterday headlines about the fact that \$100 million was being surreptitiously spent by this administration to develop secret detention centers where torture is performed around the world. What is ironic is this bill contains \$21.5 million in appropriations for the victims of the torture. How hypocritical it must seem for the United States to provide money for the victims of torture at the same time that we allow torture to go on in our name around the world. Do we really want to have people every time they hear the words George W. Bush, do we really want them to think in their minds George W. Pinochet? I do not; but, unfortunately, that is what you are going to trigger in people's minds around the world.

I hope that this Congress will live up to its responsibilities to end that practice by supporting the McCain amendment on the Defense bill. I hope that when that Defense bill leaves the House and goes to the White House that it contains that provision, despite the White House's threat of a veto, despite the action of the Secretary of Defense in opposing the McCain amendment. It is a moral imperative that we adopt that amendment on the Defense bill. Otherwise, the \$21 million in this bill for victims of torture is a joke and a sham.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the newest member of our subcommittee.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York, for her cooperation in yielding me this time.

I want to rise just to say that it has been a pleasure to work on this bill. There is a lot of good in it, and I want to highlight a particular part thereof

and thank the ranking member and the chairman and the staffs of the two sides for working with me on an initiative to work to clean up the blood supply in sub-Saharan Africa where millions of people have contracted HIV through tainted blood transfusions.

We have an initiative in the report that accompanies the bill that would provide millions to focus in on pediatrics, transfusions first and foremost, but also to require a group of entities and agencies, including the World Health Organization, the CDC and the National Institutes of Health, to develop a nonincremental approach and plan within 180 days to clean up the blood supply throughout sub-Saharan Africa and put an appropriate emphasis on saving millions of lives that needlessly are being lost through HIV because of blood transfusions that otherwise could be safe.

So I just want to thank the leadership of the subcommittee, the chair and ranking member and staff, for their cooperation.

There are other important initiatives in the bill in terms of clean water programs in Africa, some \$15 million; and there are other things that are not, I think, given appropriate notice because of some of the larger items in the bill; but I think that these are very, very important. I just want the record to be clear that I thank the ranking member and the chair for their cooperation and will continue to want to build on these efforts because we can save millions of lives.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ).

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the time, and I commend Chairman KOLBE for bringing this conference report to the floor; and I rise in full support of it.

U.S. foreign aid helps promote economic development and strengthens democracy certainly around the world.

□ 1030

That being said, Mr. Speaker, our foreign aid and our Nation's gift to our friends around the world should not be taken for granted. We are not obliged to give foreign aid, and I believe the countries that receive that foreign aid should be held to certain standards, particularly living up to extradition agreements our country has made with them.

Included in this bill is a provision, section 581 specifically, that is going to help return cop killers to the U.S. to stand trial. For years, cop killers have been finding safe haven by fleeing the U.S. after committing their unthinkable crimes.

This problem came to my attention in May of this year when Denver Police Officer Donnie Young was allegedly executed by Raul Gomez-Garcia. After killing Detective Young and shooting and wounding his partner, Gomez-Garcia immediately fled to Mexico where he has since been tracked down and arrested.

Gomez-Garcia's extradition back to the United States is now pending, but only because Denver DA Mitch Morrissey made the only choice available to him, and that is to seek a lesser plea bargain sentence. The United States should not be forced to plea bargain with other countries, nor should full justice be denied family members of assassinated cops. This appropriations bill will help us put an end to rewarding foreign nations with foreign aid that provide safe haven to cop killers.

Again, I urge its adoption and I commend Chairman KOLBE and the ranking member for bringing this to the floor, and Chairman LEWIS and the full committee for the great work they have done on all our appropriations bills in this Congress.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and Chairman KOLBE for his leadership. I want to thank both my colleagues for working each and every year to create a bipartisan bill that I think is worthy of our support.

I also would like to thank our staffs for working diligently and for their commitment to the issues which are in this bill, and especially I would like to thank Aysha and Christos on my staff who have worked tirelessly on these amendments.

I am very pleased that the Lee amendment to ban the sale and transfer of excess weapons for use by the Haitian National Police and the State Department accountability report of the police involvement in criminal activity were included in this bill. Specifically, my amendment prohibits all arms transfers and sales by the State Department for use by the Haitian National Police and requires an investigation into implications of senior and rank-and-file members in corruption, kidnappings, and narcotics trafficking, as documented by the State Department's International Narcotics Control Strategy reports.

Additionally, not later than 60 days after the enactment, the State Department will report to Congress their findings on the investigations into police abuse, including whether any United States-supplied or -provided weapons or ammunition were used during massacres perpetrated by the Haitian National Police. Now, I expect these restrictions would apply to any money designated for Haiti, including the funding in the Foreign Military Financing Program, the International Military Education and Training, and the International Narcotic Control and Law Enforcement programs.

This amendment is very necessary in the effort to restore democracy in Haiti. Haiti desperately needs humanitarian assistance; however, non-humanitarian assistance, like weapons and arms, only exacerbates Haiti's

struggle with violence and criminal activity within the Haitian National Police Force and throughout the population.

Mr. Speaker, disarmament is impossible if we are complicit in sending arms to the country. With crime uncontrollable, human rights a distant goal, and elections on the horizon, it is unconscionable that the United States would support the sale and free transfer of arms. That is why I am pleased that the Foreign Ops conferees agreed to limiting the transfer and sale of U.S.-based arms to Haiti. It is necessary to help the curbing of growing violence and to support an environment for peaceful and free elections.

I also appreciate the efforts by Chairman KOLBE and Ranking Member LOWEY to get \$2.82 billion in this bill for our global HIV and AIDS programs, including \$450 million for the Global Fund to fight HIV and AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. While I believe, like many, that this number could be and should have been at least \$150 million higher to match the Senate funding level, \$2.8 billion is a step in the right direction.

Finally, I would like to say that I think our overall foreign aid budget should be significantly increased to alleviate poverty throughout the world.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time and for her leadership, along with that of the chairman of the subcommittee, for the collaborative efforts in improving America's foreign policy.

This bill, more than any other I think, sets the tone and the pathway for Americans yet not born. Our relationships around the world help us to create a harmonious world, if that is possible, and one that applauds democracy and looks toward the United States in a collaborative and friendly manner.

I rise as well to thank the committee for its work in Haiti and particularly the dollars that will be utilized for a speedy and transparent election. In a delegation that I joined just a few weeks ago, we met with the interim prime minister, interim president of Haiti, to talk about the importance of secure elections, to talk about the importance of releasing political prisoners and allowing those individuals who are seeking to run for the highest office in Haiti to be allowed to be on the ballot. These dollars for Haitian elections are absolutely imperative, but also the instructions, if you will, the cajoling of the government to ensure that there are safe and free elections.

We all have watched the horror in Pakistan as now the mounting numbers rise to upwards of 80,000 people that may be dead. Some of the areas

are impassable and it is hard for aid to reach those areas, but there are still people there who will be subjected to the bitter cold. I applaud the language that is in the legislation as given to me by Congresswoman LOWEY that suggests we should be concerned about the devastation and as well to seek to reprogram a number of dollars, particularly possibly dollars from the \$300 million in economic assistance. I would ask the State Department and the President, working with the Pakistani Government, to move those dollars as quickly as possible to begin to solve the problem of the bitter cold and the lack of housing.

And might I also ask for support in the Millennium Fund. I had hoped that the Millennium Fund could have been higher, but I am grateful for the work that has been done in that area. And I also join the ranking member of the full committee in the hope that the torture amendment will be considered, because I believe the torture amendment equates to a dignified American foreign policy.

Let me simply close by saying that there is certainly good dollars in the Global Fund and work on the malaria and tuberculosis dollars; but I hope as we look to the future we can raise those dollars, because that speaks to the quality of life for people who cannot speak for themselves or help themselves.

Again, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for the work they have done on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Report to H. R. 3057, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for FY 2006. In so doing, I congratulate the chairman and ranking member of the full committee as well as the chairman and madam ranking member of the subcommittee for their diligence in pulling together a comprehensive compromise among the many global initiatives—which is no simple challenge.

While I shudder to see 20 percent of the \$20 billion allocated for military assistance compared to a little over 1 percent to fight global HIV/AIDS, I am pleased to see the commitment shown by both Chambers to play a key role in the relief and reconstruction of Pakistan, India, and other Himalayan areas affected by the massive earthquake. In particular, I applaud the \$365 million outlay for "International Disaster and Famine Assistance" account and the \$300,000 outlay to Pakistan in the "Economic Support Fund" account.

As we are all fully aware, on Saturday, October 8, 2005, an earthquake registering a 7.6 magnitude struck Pakistan with the epicenter being near Muzaffarabad, the capital of Pakistani Kashmir. This earthquake was the strongest to hit the region in a century and has severely stretched the resources of the Pakistani Government. In addition, according to the most recent reports, the death total has exceeded 73,000. Unfortunately, the mountainous terrain coupled with the approach of winter and bad weather has drastically halted relief operations to the tens of thousands of injured survivors and the estimated two million people who have been left homeless.

In addition to the massive destruction of homes, the earthquake has also damaged sanitation systems, destroyed hospitals and left many victims with no access to clean drinking water; thus, making survivors more vulnerable to disease. Due to these conditions, measles and waterborne diseases such as cholera and diarrhea could spread quickly among survivors. Measles, deadly for children, are already endemic in the region and only 60 percent of the children are protected. Interestingly enough, it has been reported by the United Nations that donor fatigue is part of the problem in a year plagued by tsunamis, hurricanes and famine. Sixty countries pledged \$1.3 billion in assistance to Pakistan, but that aid is not necessarily cash or readily available.

In closing let me note that we must continue to support the relief efforts in Pakistan. So much more needs to be done during this tragic time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of H.R. 3057, the foreign operations appropriations legislation, and specifically I want to thank the conference committee for including language I authored which would authorize the appropriation of \$5 million to the Department of State to combat piracy in countries that are not members of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development.

According to recent figures from the International Intellectual Property Association, worldwide motion picture piracy losses each year are estimated to be between \$3 billion and \$4 billion. More than 52 million illegal optical disks of the Motion Picture Association of America's member companies were seized worldwide during 2004, a result of 41,000 raids and more than 65,000 investigations.

Our government continues to work to secure legal protections for American-produced intellectual property. The State Department works with numerous countries to improve their legal codes and law enforcement training and to enforce intellectual property protections. However, in order for such efforts to be more effective, we must provide adequate funding and tools to engage foreign governments and convince them of the needs to enforce these laws.

That is why I am especially pleased that the final conference report has specifically included authorization language for a new program to combat piracy in non-OECD countries. It would provide equipment and training for judges and prosecutors, law enforcement officials, and assist other governments in complying with international copyright and intellectual property treaties and agreements.

Although the bill earmarks \$5 million for existing appropriations for international narcotics control and law enforcement, I am hopeful that the money will enable the International

Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs Bureau to strengthen its existing work. Furthermore, I hope the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs will be able to receive the funding under the newly authorized programs in future years.

In conclusion, I want to note that this sensible bipartisan language has been adopted in this House three times, and I thank the ranking member and the chair.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, to close, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the chairman yielding me a brief amount of time. I am not rising actually to close, but rather to say to the body how much I believe both the ranking member and I very much appreciate the tone that has been set by the leadership of the gentlewoman from New York and the gentleman from Arizona.

The bill that was passed through our process last year, the bill this year reflects absolutely the best of our work in the Appropriations Committee on a bill that is perhaps as important as any of our subcommittee reports. This bill reflects our effort by way of both Houses to support foreign policy that in the long term reflects America's interest in the world.

There is absolutely no question that the assistance that goes forward with these bills and through this effort has a huge impact upon providing a positive slant to America's voice in the world. I could not feel more strongly than I do that foreign affairs should be handled in a nonpartisan way, and this bill is the first bill in my memory that had the signature of every member of the conference committee from both bodies, Democrat and Republican alike. It is incredible to see us move in the direction of actually have the House recognize how important foreign assistance is and foreign affairs is in terms of America's interest in this complex and shrinking world.

So congratulations is long overdue for the work of this very fine staff, but most important the leadership of Mrs. LOWEY and the leadership of my friend, JIM KOLBE, making a real difference on behalf of this changing and complex circumstance that we are responsible to play a leading role in.

The President should recognize just how important this tool will be as he goes forward in trying to have our voice have the impact we must have in the world.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his kind remarks, and I urge all the Members to support this conference report which has been crafted.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3057, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for 2006. I want to commend Chairman KOLBE and Ranking Member LOWEY for their tireless efforts. As a conferee on this bill, and as a member of the

Subcommittee, I wanted to ensure that H.R. 3057 addressed global needs that often go unheeded or are under-funded.

I am particularly pleased with funding levels for HIV/AIDS, which include \$2.8 billion in funding. The bill provides \$350 million for bilateral HIV/AIDS and \$243 million for Malaria and Tuberculosis programs. I am also pleased that I was able to work with Chairman KOLBE and Ranking Member LOWEY to insert language that supports funding through USAID to provide medical and programmatic initiatives related to HIV/AIDS in Nigeria.

Additionally, H.R. 3057 doubles funding to support aid to the Palestinians for development programs. The bill provides funding for debt restructuring for Heavily Indebted Poor Countries, HIPC, and provides \$110 million for the Middle East Partnership Initiative, MEPI, and \$390 million for humanitarian efforts supported by non-governmental organization, NGOs, in Sudan.

Finally, this bill provides essential funding to two of our staunchest allies in the ongoing war against terrorism, Egypt and Jordan, both of which are countries involved in promoting economic and political reform that will lead to freer and more transparent democratic societies.

Clearly, H.R. 3057 is the best bill we could fashion within very tight budget constraints. I am pleased to offer my support to H.R. 3057 and urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the Fiscal Year 2006 Foreign Operations Conference Report includes over \$131 million for alternative development and institution building in Colombia. These funds will help foster both economic and social development and create more stability in Colombia.

A key element to fostering a secure Colombia is creating growth and stability in the neglected rural areas. The government of Colombia must develop and implement a comprehensive rural development policy. I would like to thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for the language in the House report that calls on USAID to report to Congress about the concrete steps the Colombian government is taking to develop a rural development strategy. This report will provide a blueprint for what the Colombian government must promote development in rural areas—and how future U.S. assistance should complement those goals.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the conference report and congratulate the Chair and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations for their leadership in crafting this important legislation and for their work in ensuring that crucial national security priorities are appropriately funded.

Even as our troops are still engaged in combat in Afghanistan and Iraq, new challenges to our Nation's security and diplomatic interests are emerging. This bill does a good job of meeting these challenges within the confines of an extremely tight budgetary environment.

I am particularly pleased that the conference agreement includes \$75 million in assistance to Armenia and \$3 million for Nagorno Karabagh. The conferees also agreed to maintain the military assistance parity between Armenia and Azerbaijan by approving \$5 million in Foreign Military Financing, FMF, and \$750,000 in International Military Education and Training, IMET, for both countries.

Through these appropriations, the conferees have continued to advance the political and economic development of the Caucasus, while also increasing stability in the region.

I was also heartened to see that the conferees continued this country's longstanding support for our democratic ally Israel by providing \$2.5 billion in assistance for Israel, including \$2.3 billion for military grants, and \$240 million in economic assistance.

At the same time, the Congress has wisely met the president's request for \$150 million for development programs for Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza, \$75 million more than the current level. Only by helping the Palestinian people to break the cycle of poverty and hopelessness can we hope to realize the vision of a two-state solution to decades of conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. I believe that it is wise that our assistance to the Palestinians goes to private voluntary organizations (20 percent) or to contractors (80 percent), all of which are selected and monitored by USAID. While I hope that Abu Mazen will be able to end the corruption in the PA, I think that it is prudent that the U.S. forego direct transfers to the PA until there is greater transparency and accountability.

This has been a difficult year for our relationship with Egypt. Even as Cairo has proven a valuable partner in helping to facilitate the Israeli pullout from Gaza, the country's moves towards democracy have been halting. I think that this bill properly funds our priorities by appropriating \$1.8 billion in aid for Egypt—\$1.3 billion for military grants, and \$495 million in economic assistance with \$50 million of the economic assistance directed to programs that promote democracy and human rights, and \$50 million be for education, including \$5 million for scholarships for disadvantaged Egyptian students.

At a time when the United States is viewed with skepticism and outright hostility in many parts of the world, foreign assistance and disaster relief is one of the most effective ways to change negative views of our country. In the wake of the tsunami last December and the October 8 earthquake in Pakistan, the generosity of the American people has been a strong force for advancing our national interests abroad, even as we wrestled with the aftermath of a devastating series of hurricanes here at home.

As the Congress and the President begin to work on the Fiscal Year 2007 budget for foreign operations, I hope that we will remember that feeding the hungry, healing the sick and helping those left homeless by nature's fury can play an important role in making the United States more secure and more respected by the rest of the world.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their work on this important legislation and offer my wholehearted support.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 358, nays 39, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 569]

YEAS—358

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards

Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Herger
Herse
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo

Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markley
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar

Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeltan
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez

Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—39

Bartlett (MD)
Berry
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
Duncan
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Green (WI)

Gutknecht
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Hostettler
Hulshof
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Keller
Lucas
Melancon
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)

Otter
Paul
Petri
Rahall
Rohrabacher
Ryun (KS)
Sensenbrenner
Stark
Stearns
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—36

Baker
Becerra
Boehlert
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buyer
Calvert
Davis (FL)
Dicks

Emerson
Filner
Ford
Gallegly
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hoyer
Issa
Kind
McMorris
Miller, Gary
Norwood

Nunes
Ortiz
Osborne
Poe
Pombo
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (WI)
Schiff
Sullivan
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt

□ 1113

Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. WEST-MORELAND changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, due to obligations in my district, I was unable to vote on the Conference Report on H.R. 3057, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006. However, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on the Conference Report on H.R. 3057.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, due to an unavoidable scheduling conflict, I was unable to vote on the Conference Report on H.R. 3057, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, on November 4, I missed rollcall vote No. 569. Rollcall vote No. 569 was on agreeing to the conference report making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, on the legislative day of Friday, November 4, 2005, I was unavoidably detained with family matters and was unable to cast a vote on rollcall vote No. 569. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on this vote.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, due to important business in my district, I was unable to vote during the following rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as indicated below:

Rollcall vote No. 569, “yea.”

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 569, on H.R. 3057, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this chamber today. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote No. 569.

Stated against:

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I missed recorded votes today in order to be with my family in California for an unexpected family emergency. I would like my intentions made known for my constituents in the 11th district. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 569, the Conference Report on H.R. 3057—Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3304

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3304.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4011

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 4011.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

□ 1115

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 1751, SECURE ACCESS TO JUSTICE AND COURT PROTECTION ACT OF 2005

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee may meet next week to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 1751, the Secure Access to Justice and Court Protection Act of 2005.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief

explanation of the amendment to the Rules Committee in room H-312 of the Capitol by 12 noon on Tuesday, November 8, 2005. Members should draft their amendments to the bill as ordered reported by the Judiciary Committee on October 27, 2005, which is expected to be filed with the House next week. Members are also advised that the text should be available for their review on the Web sites of both the Judiciary Committee and the Rules Committee by this afternoon, November 4.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Rules Committee, to inquire about the schedule for next week.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Obviously, the House has completed its work for the day and for the week.

We will convene at 12:30 on Monday for morning hour and at 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A final list of those measures to be scheduled will be getting to Members' offices by the end of the day. Any votes that may be called on those measures will be rolled until 6:30 Monday afternoon or early Monday evening.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the House will consider additional legislation under suspension of the rules, as well as two measures, the one I just mentioned, H.R. 1751, and I announced the filing of amendments for that, and also the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005, which is much talked about here. We also anticipate that the House will next week consider additional appropriations conference reports as they become available.

On Friday, we will not be in session, as Members know, so that there will be an opportunity for all of us to participate in Veterans' Day ceremonies that take place in our districts.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding; and I would be happy to entertain any questions he might have.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday is Election Day in many States and localities around the country. Given that we are scheduled to be in session and voting, how do you think votes might be structured that day in order to accommodate Members who have elections in their States?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will tell my col-

leagues that the State I represent is nearly 3,000 miles away, and we are having a very important election in our State. I have voted by absentee ballot. I did that just this week and sent my ballot in.

We have a great deal of work to do, not only on Tuesday but next week, so we will be meeting here, and we have the items that I mentioned, the measures that will be considered under suspension, we have the very important Secure Access to Justice and Court Protection Act that needs to be considered, and we just have to proceed with our work.

So let me say that we do want every Member to participate in those elections, but I suspect that, in light of the fact that we will have so much work to do here, that Members should plan to be in Washington during the day on Tuesday.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, could the chairman tell me what appropriations conference reports we might expect to see on the floor next week?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, as I said in my remarks earlier today, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), has done an absolutely phenomenal job in moving these measures through. As you know, we have just voted on the foreign operations appropriations bill conference report, and we have three conference groups that are continuing to meet on Energy and Water, the Science, State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill, and the Military Quality of Life appropriations conference report.

From the conversation I have had with the chairman of the committee, it is his hope that we have those three measures up for consideration at some point next week.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Does the gentleman have any idea of which days they may go to conference?

Mr. DREIER. All three of those bills that I mentioned, the Energy and Water conference report and the Science, State, Justice, and Commerce conference report, and Military Quality of Life, they are all in conference as we speak. It is our hope that those conferences will be completed and those conference reports will be filed in the House. We cannot anticipate exactly when their work will be completed. We just want it to happen as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, on which day next week might we consider the budget reconciliation bill that calls for more than \$50 billion in mandatory spending cuts?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, as I think the gentleman heard in my announcement, I announced that it is our anticipation, we anticipate that we will consider what we call the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005, and it is a measure which we will be working on next week.

Late next week or the middle to the latter part of next week, we anticipate

a vote here in the House on that very important measure that is designed to try and reduce the deficit and reform government and ensure that we can do the very important work that the American people sent us here to do.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Is the gentleman suggesting that we not call it mandatory spending cuts? You are calling it reduction, budget reduction?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, what this deals with is mandatory spending, and what this deals with is the deficit challenge which Democrats and Republicans regularly decry here, and we are trying to focus on the reduction of the deficit, and that is the reason that we are appropriately referring to this as the Deficit Reduction Act.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

I would further like to inquire about the majority plan to extend the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act. This is an important issue that has had broad bipartisan support in the past, and action is needed because it is scheduled to expire on December 31.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I will say that this very important legislation, which I personally support, is at this moment being discussed by the leadership of the Financial Services Committee. They are working with the Department of the Treasury and Members in the leadership of the Banking Committee on the other side of the aisle, and we do hope very much that we will be able to put together a legislative package that can be considered before that very important December 31 date to which my friend referred.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I really want to thank the gentleman for being patient. I understand that our Financial Services Committee Democrats stand ready to work on a bipartisan basis on this, and they have asked for a markup as soon as possible. Since time is running out, I would like to ask my colleague why we could not simply take up H.R. 1153, a bill that is a largely bipartisan product that the Financial Services Committee reported last fall, but never acted upon.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would say that we are taking that into consideration. We do not have it scheduled at this moment, but I appreciate my friend's raising this issue, and we will certainly take it under advisement and look at your recommendation, I hope from your perspective, favorably.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, NOVEMBER, 7, 2005

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET CUTS

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled by the cruel and short-sighted leadership the Republican Party is giving us in planning to ram through this reconciliation next week. They want to provide an additional \$70 billion to \$100 billion in tax cuts for the privileged and the powerful and their Fortune 500 corporate benefactors. In order to pay for this, they plan to cut \$4.9 billion from child support programs that help collect money from deadbeat dads; \$14.5 billion from student aid programs, \$9.5 billion in Medicaid, and they even want to cut tens of millions of dollars from low-income energy assistance.

Mr. Speaker, you will hear more from the Progressive Caucus, more from the Democratic Party next week about just how unfair these cuts will be to real moderate-income people and the very poor people in this country and how much they will benefit the very, very wealthy people in this country.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, well, next week the Republicans have discovered that we are awash in a sea of red ink, supposedly. Under the Bush watch, with the Republicans in charge of both Houses of Congress, the national debt has increased by 62 percent, to \$8 trillion in 5 short years, quite an accomplishment. We are borrowing \$1.3 billion a day to run the government. If we eliminated everything the government does except for homeland security and defense, we would still have a deficit.

□ 1130

They say they are going to make some infinitesimal cuts and little

phony baloney and that is fiscal responsibility. Let us talk about what they are proposing to cut.

Well, the biggest whack they are taking is at students. They do not know any students who have to borrow money or get scholarships to go to school. Why, the children of the rich, they just write out a check and pay cash; they are legacy students at the best schools. \$14.3 billion of additional costs on students who want to borrow a little money to get a better education and get ahead, doubling the origination fee, costing them as much as \$6,000 over the life of their loans.

Kids are graduating with mountains of debt. That is a responsible cut, according to the Republicans. Well then there are those little guys in the elementary and secondary schools who are eating too much. They are eating too much. They are going to cut back on the school nutrition program and the breakfast program and the eligibility of poor kids to eat.

They are just eating too much. They do not know anybody who is hungry in this country. And then the phony baloney. I am on the Resources Committee. They are assuming over \$3 billion for leasing the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge, 50 times as much per acre as the Naval Petroleum Reserve was just leased for, where there is known oil, in an area where there is no known oil.

So we got phony baloney and mean spirited cuts. Now, why? Are they really fiscally responsible? Well, this would be a big, you know, almost one-tenth of 1 percent of the projected deficit over the next 5 years. I guess that is better than nothing. Except that there are ways to make much bigger cuts. We could roll back the 2001-2003 tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent, those who earn over \$350,000 a year. That would bring in \$327 billion, six times what they are pretending to save here.

We could do away with some offshore tax shelters, \$65 billion more than what they are talking about here. We could cancel the President's mission to Mars. That is \$1 trillion over the next 20 years, \$100 billion to go back to the Moon again. That would save twice as much money. No, those things go after the powerful special interests or the contributor class, and God forbid they should take them on.

But they can get the little kids in the schools and take the food off their plates. They can go off the students struggling to rise up or stay in the middle class and double their origination fees for their loans.

But they will not make these kinds of real cuts, ones that would hit at those who earn over \$300,000 a year or hit at the powerful special interests who are, you know, who are involved in the Federal contracting with NASA.

And then there is waste and abuse. What about the waste and abuse? Apparently, the Bush administration, Brownie is still writing, Brownie, you are doing a heck of a job. He is still on the Federal payroll for \$150,000, and he

is letting out contracts, such as a contract, put a blue tarp on a roof. A lot of people in Oregon do that when they find out they got a leak when it starts to rain, they go up, climb up on the roof, put up a tarp. The tarp costs \$8.

Well, the Federal Government is paying a contractor \$2,500 to put blue tarps per roof down there in the Southeast, yet another great job by heck-of-a-job Brownie, who is still pulling down \$150,000 a year from the Federal taxpayers.

So there is a little waste, fraud, and abuse that they can go after. No. But these are the big contractors, Fluor and others, who are benefiting and profiting immensely from gouging the Federal taxpayer.

So we should have real fiscal responsibility; but they have no sense of it, because the real money goes to the powerful and the special interests in this country. They are the ones looting the Federal Treasury, and they have the gall to come to the floor of the House and say it is the Democrats. You have been in charge for 5 years. Five years. The Presidency, the House, and the Senate for almost that whole time, and you have increased the debt by 62 percent.

You have done nothing about the waste, fraud and abuse. In fact, it has gotten worse on your watch, and now you want to stick it to the kids who want to get an education and to hungry children and primary and secondary schools and pretend you are going to sell leases for a heck of a lot more than you will.

You should be ashamed. The sea of red ink spreads, and it grows deeper. Most Americans are drowning, but the yachts of the wealthy are floating high.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PROPOSED LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to share a letter that I will be sending to President Bush next week. I hope that all of my colleagues will join me in signing this important letter, because it is time for Congress to end the war in Iraq and bring the troops home.

Here is the letter: Dear Mr. President. Despite 2½ years of warfare, including the deaths of over 2,000 soldiers and injuries to 15,000 others, Iraq remains as unstable as it was when you

declared an end to major combat operations in May of 2003.

We need to face the fact that the situation in Iraq is not improving, nor will it improve as long as our troops remain there. Because the presence of over 160,000 soldiers in Iraq and on Iraqi soil is the main catalyst fueling Iraq's insurgency. The time is long overdue for the U.S. to change course in Iraq and bring our troops home.

To transition from war to peace, we recommend that your administration immediately make four pivotal policy changes in Iraq. First: engage in greater multilateral cooperation with our allies. Second: pursue diplomatic non-military initiatives. Third: prepare for a robust post-conflict reconciliation process. And, fourth: withdraw the U.S. armed Forces. Multilateral cooperation.

The United States must engage the international community, including the U.N. and NATO, to establish a multinational interim security force for Iraq. The Department of Peacekeeping Operations at the United Nations, for example, is well suited for this task.

Diplomatic nonmilitary initiatives. The U.S. must pursue a diplomatic offensive, shifting its role from that of Iraq's military occupier to its reconstruction partner. This means giving Iraq back to the Iraqi people, working with them to rebuild their economic and physical infrastructure and creating Iraqi jobs.

The U.S. must also engage the United Nations to oversee Iraq's economic and humanitarian needs, renounce any desire to control Iraqi oil, and ensure that the United States does not maintain lasting military bases in Iraq.

Post-conflict reconciliation. Establish an international peace commission to oversee Iraq's post-war reconciliations. This group would include members of the global community who have experience in international peace-building and conflict resolution and would be tasked with coordinating peace talks between Iraq's various factions.

Withdrawal of the U.S. Armed Forces. The cost of the war in Iraq, both human and financial, has been staggering. Tragically, the American and Iraqi lives lost and the billions of dollars spent have failed to actually make our country safer from the threat of international terrorism. To end the war in Iraq, save lives, and prevent the U.S. from spiraling even further into debt, the U.S. must withdraw its Armed Forces now.

Mr. President, after Iraq holds its December parliamentary elections, the country's leaders will be responsible for charting Iraq's course. The international community, including the United States, can then provide non-militaristic support to ensure the sufficiency of Iraq.

We look forward to your response to our recommendations, and we would welcome the opportunity to discuss them with you further. Mr. Speaker, I

will send this letter to the President in the coming days. Not only is it long overdue from the Bush administration to end the war in Iraq; it is long overdue for this body, the Congress of America, to do our part in ending the war in Iraq.

I urge all of my colleagues to lend their signatures to this timely, important letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURGESS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LEWIS of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCCAUL of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HURRICANE WILMA VICTIMS NEED HELP IN SOUTH FLORIDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon all across south Florida, there are thousands of people whose homes have been condemned. They have been condemned following a category 3 hurricane called Hurricane Wilma.

Subsequently in the last few days, it has been pouring rain. I went door to door in my district over the weekend and met hundreds of men and women in their 80s and 90s stuck in their apartments with no power. At one point, I came upon a 93-year-old woman in her kitchen with her 90-year-old next-door neighbor who were looking with despair at an MRE, trying to figure out how to get it open, put it together, and get it heating so that they could have the first hot food, something resembling hot food, that they had had in 5 days.

I literally had to help them with the print on the instructions that was this big, try to figure out how to put that

meal together without burning themselves, because as soon as you put the water in the meal, it starts to immediately heat up.

This was not an isolated incident. In the 2 days after that, those women and the other senior citizens that I represent in the Sunrise Lakes Condominium were told that they needed to leave their apartments because after the rain, the leaking through their condominium roof was so bad that their apartments were uninhabitable.

They are now in an elementary school with no shower, with a make-shift shower that was put together with two porta-potties shoved next to each other and plastic sheeting taped up with a hose stuck over the top so that they could bathe. We are talking about men and women in their upper 80s and 90s.

Hurricane Wilma has caused tremendous suffering in south Florida, and there has not been enough national attention on the plight of my constituents and the constituents of my south Florida colleagues. We need to make sure that we are able to provide the help and assistance that they so desperately need.

There is need across this country, and next week we are going to add insult to injury and apply a manmade disaster in the form of the budget reconciliation, which is Washington-speak for budget cuts. There are going to be proposed housing cuts, Medicare cuts, food stamps, school lunches. Between Katrina and Wilma, and all of the suffering going on across this country, now is not the time to add more harm and do more damage to people who are badly in need.

Mr. Speaker, we need to do right by Americans, not pull the rug out from under them. I urge my colleagues to make sure that we provide the badly needed assistance, both to victims of Hurricane Katrina on the gulf coast and to victims of Katrina from south Florida.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be back here on the House floor on behalf of the 30-Something Working Group. We have been coming to the floor, Mr. Speaker, now for a couple of years weekly; and over the past several months we have turned it into a nightly, and sometimes bi-nightly, event, where we come down

here and we talk about what is going on in the Nation's capital.

We do not only talk about what is going on with regard to people who are our age, within the 30-Something Working Group, although the original mission of our group was to explain and to lay out the facts for people who are in our generation, in their 30s with families, and how the decisions that are being made here affect that group of people.

Since then, we have broadened this really to touch on all of the issues, because it seemed as we got further and further into the budget cuts, the tax program that the Republicans have, the war, the inability to address the natural disasters, we have broadened our mission to deal with all of these issues, because all of these issues hit home to not only people who are in their 30s but people across the country.

□ 1145

We have come to find that the decisions over the past several years that we have been here, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) and I are on our third year. The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is a freshman member. But over the past several years we have seen up close and certainly personal the absolute failure of the Republican party and their ability to govern, the total and complete incompetence.

This is not a party issue. The only reason we have to talk about parties is because the Republicans control the House. They control the Senate. They control the White House. And when you are running \$500 billion deficits a year, you are spending \$1.5 billion a week in Iraq, creating a welfare state there, you are cutting taxes on people who make billions of dollars a year here in the U.S., you take public tax money and you give it, to the tune of \$16 billion in the last few months, this Congress has taken taxes from average, middle-class people. You sent it down here, Mr. Speaker. The average people sent it down here.

And this Republican Congress and Republican Senate and Republican President give that tax money, \$16 billion worth, to the oil industry. The most profitable industry in the world right now is the oil industry, and public tax money is going to subsidize the oil industry.

Then our friends in the Republican party go down the "shake-down street," K Street, where all the lobbyists are. Anyone who has been to Washington, you go to K Street, that is where the big major lobby firms are. The Republicans then, after giving the public tax money in subsidies to the oil companies, they go out to "shake-down street" and they shake down the lobbyists for money. So the lobbyists then give the money to the Republican party so they can spend it on their campaigns. And we have a big hole here because the only group missing in this equation is the American people, the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK).

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Let me share something very quick, because I want to make sure that Members, staff, everyone understands what is going on, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is hitting the nail right on the head, hitting it with the hammer right on the head like a good carpenter.

I can tell you what is happening now in Washington, D.C., is unprecedented in history of the United States of America. Let me say it again. What is happening now in the United States as it relates to its governance, I am not saying the everyday Americans, because folks are waking up and going to work every day. Small businesses are going to open their stores to be able to bring about the kind of commerce they need in their local communities. Kids are waking up, going to school to hopefully educate themselves. But as it relates to governance we are falling short.

We are robbing, a couple of years ago we could say future generations, I would say we are robbing Americans in the present. So when these kinds of activities that we are talking about taking place under light and under camera, then I am very concerned about what is going on in the back halls of Congress.

Now I am going to tell you right now, it is not the Meek report. It is not the Ryan report. It not the Wasserman Schultz report. This is what is happening in our country right now. We have fiscal responsibility used as some sort of whim word or some sort of punchline. It is not being used in a way that it should be used.

It is not saying to billionaires, no, we cannot give you another tax break because we have a war going on, as a matter of fact, two. We have three natural disasters that have hit our country in an unprecedented way. We have Medicare that some here in this Congress on the majority side want to cut. So we have to say no to the special interests.

Also, I am going to tell you, and I just want to make sure that folks understand what we are talking about. It is unprecedented as it relates to a lack of governance in the history of the country.

Now I am just going to point out just a few things here, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), you can continue or we can move on to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ). But I can tell you this, USA Today, I did not print this. The gentleman did not print this. "Outing of a CIA agent."

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. One of our third-party validators.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. One of our third-party validators.

"Outing of CIA agent. Louisiana can't pay Katrina and Rita bills." But, meanwhile, folks are running around cutting the very programs that help

folks in Louisiana and Mississippi and other affected areas, in South Florida as it relates to Wilma and others, cutting programs that will help the very people that State is trying to use.

The Washington Times, let me take this little promo off here. Washington Times, a conservative paper here in Washington, D.C. It talks about issues that are coming before the Congress, and it talks about the other issues that are taking place in Capitol Hill, maybe not on the front page but within the paper talking about indictments and hearings.

The Washington Post, a big front-page picture. Not about some sort of program or some sort of way that we are helping middle-class families, not talking about bringing the costs down of gas or heating oil or anything like that. No, it talks about the fact that the popularity, 58 percent in a poll questioned the integrity of the President of the United States.

Now I am not one to question the integrity of the President of the United States, but I can tell you this: That it is interesting that individuals can out or in said indictment, out CIA agents and then forget about it. Oh, like I said last night, I was going to get a cup of coffee, and I walked over—I cannot remember when I outed the CIA agent.

The bottom line is something is very wrong as it relates to what is going on in this country, as it relates to governance.

The New York Times, the same. You can pick up a paper, the Members when they fly back to their districts, since we finished our business for this week, they can pick up the papers and find the same thing. We cannot explain ourselves or spin ourselves out of this situation. This Congress is rated below, 35, 31 percent. Who is counting at this particular time? But I can tell you something is very wrong.

We have to rise up and provide the leadership. That is why we come to this floor. We challenge the majority side to stand up and govern. And the reason why we have this kind of atmosphere in Washington is because we have not called these individuals out on the carpet. Need it be executive branch, Federal agencies, those that are taking the American people's tax dollars and doing what they may.

\$14 billion yesterday in the Budget Committee and a hike in fees in students loans, in student assistance at a time when we are talking about providing jobs. So I am just going to say that we need to be alarmed by some of this. We need to be able to let folks know that we are about changing this kind of atmosphere here in Washington, D.C.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. The gentleman is absolutely right.

The gentleman talked about, he started his last couple of minutes talking about the precedent-setting activity in this administration. To take that a step further, let us talk about just how precedent setting this administration is.

They are certainly precedent setting in terms of ethical lapses, in terms of corruption and cronyism and the lack of confidence.

You have literally, with the indictment of Mr. Libby on Friday, the first White House official to be indicted in 130 years. Now, throughout our lifetime, throughout our lifetime and the lifetime of our generation here in the 30-Something Working Group, you go through probably our earliest memory of our administration would be Nixon. We were young kids during the Nixon administration, but obviously that was a pretty significant scandal.

Then you move forward. Nothing too terrible in the Ford administration. People obviously had some deep concerns or over Mr. Carter administration but nothing ethical to speak of. Obviously, with Iran Contra and the Reagan administration and the number of officials who were investigated and subpoenaed there were deep concerns, but no one indicted from the White House.

The same thing with President Clinton. No indictments of people in the White House. Definitely some questions, but now we reach the Bush administration.

Does the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) have the chart with him from the other day where we can put it up and show people and the Speaker what the President said during his campaign? Is that with us?

As we are getting it, if you recall, the President when he was a candidate for President talked about how he was going to transform the standards of ethics of the White House and that anyone working in his administration was going to be held to the highest of standards. That it was not just going to be whether they have actually broke the law, but the standard, and here it is.

President Bush's promise that he made as a candidate that, "In my administration we will ask not only what is legal but what is right. Not just what the lawyers allow but what the public deserves."

Well, I do not know, I guess prevarication is just a common practice. It is just part of their culture, part of their culture of corruption and cronyism and incompetence.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. A double standard for people working in their administration.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Right. I guess they believe they can say anything they want to. They do not have to follow it, and there would be no consequences. But, see, unfortunately for them, fortunately for the American people, the American people get it now. They are on to them.

Let us talk about the Washington Post poll, and I know we will have an opportunity to put this up in poster form probably next week, but one of the questions that the Washington Post/ABC News poll asked was, Please tell me whether the following state-

ment applies to Bush or not: He is honest and trustworthy. In May of 2004, 53 percent of the American people answered that question yes and 45 percent said no. Now 40 percent think he is honest and trustworthy, and 58 percent say he is not.

I think that is in part because you can tell a lot about a person by the people they surround themselves with. Right now, let us look at who is surrounding the President of the United States or who previously was surrounding him.

You have Mr. Libby, who was indicted on Friday; and, of course, it is not confirmed unless and until he is convicted. He is not guilty of a crime yet. But he was indicted. The first official in the White House in 130 years. The President said if somebody committed a crime they will no longer work in his administration.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) I know will probably talk a few minutes about the difference in the shifting sands of the President's statements. But you have Mr. Rove who increasingly it has become clear, as clear as a bell, that he absolutely was directly involved in outing a covert CIA agent, directly involved, yet he is still in the White House with the highest security clearance, access to the most top secret information.

It is easy to see why 58 percent of the American people do not think the President is honest and trustworthy. Because if you take it a step further, the same Washington Post/ABC News poll says it has been reported that another subject of the investigation has been Karl Rove, who has been a close advisor to Bush.

The question was, Given what you have heard or read, do you think Rove did anything wrong in connection with this case or not? If yes, do you think he did something unethical but not illegal or did you think that he did something illegal? Forty-nine percent of the American people answered that question that he did something wrong for sure. Of the 49 percent, 26 percent believe he did something illegal and 23 percent think he did something unethical. Forty-nine percent of people asked believe that Karl Rove did something either illegal or unethical, and 59 percent of the people believe that he should resign from the White House.

Now, is President Bush so incompetent that he is not able to cope without Mr. Rove by his side? I do not know. Generally, I expect that, I know I surround myself with a number of competent people. You make sure you put together a team of people that does not rise and fall on one person and their knowledge and ability to assist you.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I can tell the gentlewoman that, as it relates to national security, protection of our homeland and as it pertains to this case, you have the question of a CIA clandestine agent whose job was charged with finding out more or

tracking down possible chemical weapons that can be used, weapons of mass destruction that can be used against the United States of America.

□ 1200

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are in the minority, and that means that the majority, which is the Republican majority, has the responsibility of governance, has the responsibility because they have the committee chairmanships. They have the Speakership. They have all of the leadership, and I will say at least I am not even going to talk about the Speakership or the leadership. I am going to talk about the committee chairpersons that have the responsibility to protect and have direct oversight over the Federal Government, making sure that we keep children, women, men, everyday Americans, safe.

What are we doing as Democrats? What we have done, not only have we put light on what is wrong as it relates to outing CIA agents, but also, there was a letter written today by four of our ranking members. A ranking member, I want to make sure I explain, that is the highest ranking Democratic Member on the said committees of jurisdiction or concern over a particular issue, in this case, security clearance.

This letter went to the associate director of division of security, and it is questioning Mr. Rove's security clearance. This did not come from the chairmen of the committees, did not come from any person of power on the majority side. This came from the minority side, on the Democratic side; and it is done by very fine Members, the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Mr. JOHN DINGELL; the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Ranking Member DAVID OBEY; also, Defense appropriations, veteran, marine, Mr. JOHN MURTHA from Pennsylvania; and also the Armed Services ranking member that we serve with, Mr. IKE SKELTON of the Armed Services Committee. They questioned the security clearance of Mr. Rove.

What the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) just finished saying is the fact that no one is that important when it is a question of outing a CIA agent and others for political gain. So that is what we are doing right now.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the point that I think that we have been trying to make here in the 30-something group. You cannot put your political party above the interests of the country; and if you out a CIA agent because it may benefit your political party, you are wrong. You are wrong. You cannot do that because it weakens the country; and you did not just out her. You outed every contact she has made in the last 20 years. You outed the front company in Boston that the CIA had. They had a front company. They talked about her being at the Belgium University. So any

American now at the University of Belgium is now suspect if they have any contacts.

This has ramifications well beyond what the average person could even understand, well beyond what we could even understand, because this woman was working on behalf of the United States of America and the one quote that sticks with me is the one CIA operative that said, outing a CIA agent is the moral equivalent of outing a military unit in a forward area. So in Baghdad, they are over there, it would be like Karl Rove or Scooter Libby saying to the insurgency in Iraq, the Marines are coming right over there in about a half an hour; that is where they are coming. That would be unacceptable.

But in the covert world, that is exactly what Karl Rove and Scooter Libby and all the minions over in the executive branch did. It was a coordinated effort to out this woman because they did not like what her husband was saying about the war, and that is wrong. That is wrong.

If you do not believe us, because we love our third-party validators, this is Melissa who was a 14-year covert CIA agent. She says, We are talking about lies and we are talking about capabilities. We do our work, we risk our lives, we risk lives of our agents in order to protect our country; and when something like this happens, it cuts to the very core of what we do. We are not being undermined by the North Koreans. We are not being undermined by the Russians. We are being undermined by officials in our own government. That I find galling.

Could you imagine being a CIA operative somewhere in the world right now and you think, do they got my back in D.C.? Do they got my back? Or are you afraid that if I get caught up in the wrong political debate, somehow I may get outed by my own government?

That is what this is all about, and to have the kind of deceit and lies take place out of the executive branch, let us just look at this.

Official A in the indictment, now we are not making this up. This is right out of the indictment for Scooter Libby. Official A, which the administration has admitted is Karl Rove, on July 10 of 2003, the middle of the summer, Official A, which is Karl Rove, advised Scooter Libby of a conversation that he had earlier that week with Bob Novak, the columnist, in which Wilson's wife was discussed as a CIA employee involved in Wilson's trip. Libby was advised by Official A, by Karl Rove, that Novak would be writing a story about Wilson's wife.

So Karl Rove told Scooter Libby in July of 2003 that Novak was going to be writing a story.

Now, September of 2003, a couple of months later, Karl Rove says to ABC News to the question Andrea Owen asked, Did you ever have any knowledge of the CIA agent or did you leak the name of the CIA agent to the press?

Any knowledge or did you leak it. Karl Rove said no. He lied to the American people. He did not lie to Andrea Owen. He lied to the American people. We know from the indictment he told Scooter Libby Novak was going to write about it, and 2 months later he says he does not know anything about it.

Then he does a CNN interview just July of this year; and he says, I will repeat what I said to ABC News when this whole thing broke some number of months ago. I did not know her name, and I did not leak her name.

Well, if you go back to the indictment, Official A, who is Karl Rove, advised Libby of the conversation that Novak would be writing a story about Wilson's wife. He lied. Now, he is in the White House making decisions on behalf of the United States of America.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Highest security clearance.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We cannot have it, unacceptable behavior, unbecoming of a White House official.

Then I am going to wrap this up. I am going to go right through this so we can get everybody involved here.

Then not only did Karl Rove and Libby lie to the American people, they lied to Scott McClellan, because he came out 2 months after the indictment and said what everyone already knew, and McClellan says, Those individuals, Rove, Libby, Abrams, assured me they were not involved with this. Another lie.

Now we have to change our language a bit to respect the rules of the House and respect the office which we are about to discuss.

This is out of the indictment. On or about June 12, 2003, that same summer that we were just talking about, Libby was advised by the Vice President of the United States that Wilson's wife worked at the CIA in the counterproliferation division. Libby understood that the Vice President had learned this information from the CIA.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, just a second. I just want to make sure you identify who Mr. Libby is.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Scooter Libby was the chief of staff of the Vice President of the United States who has been indicted under five counts: two counts of making false statements, two counts of perjury and one count of obstruction of justice. So the Vice President on June 12 told Mr. Libby about Joe Wilson's wife. Then 2 months later, in September, the Vice President is on Tim Russert. Okay.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Sunday news show.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The big time, the prime time.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. "Meet the Press," syndicated affiliates, one of the most respected journalists in Washington, D.C.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Tim Russert, son of Big Russ, Buffalo, Ohio, John Carroll graduate.

Mr. Russert says to the Vice President, this is 2 months after the Vice

President told Libby about Joe Wilson's wife. Russert says, Joe Wilson says he came back from Niger and said that, in fact, he could not find any documentation that in fact Niger had sent uranium to Iraq or engaged in that activity and reported it back to the proper channels.

Question: Were you briefed on his findings in February-March of 2003?

Vice President CHENEY: No, I do not know Joe Wilson. I have never met Joe Wilson.

Now, talk about what is the meaning of "is" is. I mean, give me a break.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Black and white.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Two months earlier, the VP told Scooter Libby about Joe Wilson's wife; and then he says 2 months later, to Tim Russert, I do not know Joe Wilson.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. How do we know that? From the notes of the chief of staff of the Vice President of the United States that said the Vice President told him in the indictment. I mean, that is not what we are saying.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is not us.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You talk about third-party validators, but if I may for a moment, the reason why the alleged activities that have been identified in this indictment and alleged activities that are in the stacks of these papers today, just today, this is not papers from the week or the month or over the past year. That is just today, and I cannot even hold up the number of papers. We could not even bring them all down here to the floor. There are just too many. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how it would look if I rolled in a cart of the newspapers that are reporting what we are saying.

I can tell you this, it even comes back here to this Congress. The fact that we are not carrying out our oversight responsibilities and we are not calling this administration into check and balance as it relates to oversight, this is the reason why this activity is going on.

I just want to share some frustration here with trying to get information from the majority side of what happened in the Clinton administration as it relates to subpoenas and what has happened in the Bush administration as it relates to subpoenas because, Mr. Speaker, I do not just want to come to the floor and say there were a plethora, a number of subpoenas that went to the Clinton administration for far less, for far less, and now we have the outing of CIA agents. We have the possibility of some hanky-panky with the intelligence that was given to the Congress of the United States. We have the possibility of other questionable activities out of this White House and from this administration, and there are not any committee chairmen that are running around saying we are going to subpoena this person, we are going to put them under oath, and they are going to come before this Congress and they are going to respond.

Let me just mention something here. September 16 of this year, I put one of my best staff people on this. I was standing there and I told him, I said, listen, I want you to make a request to the Congressional Research Service, which is the service that we use here in the Congress to give us the facts that we need to know as it relates to putting together legislation coming to the floor, sharing with the Members, with the American people, and I want you to find out how many subpoenas were issued from not the Senate but the House of Representatives during the 8 years of the Clinton administration versus the going-on-now 5 years of the Bush administration from this Congress.

That was September 16. He makes a request. We call over to the Congressional Research Service. God bless them. I like them. Okay. These are the nicest people, Mr. Speaker, that are involved in this whole atmosphere here in Washington, D.C. They are over at the Library of Congress. Some of these folks have been there 30-plus years. Some of them are very young, bright, intelligent folks. I mean, all of them are. They are the nicest people. They come over and they brief us. They shudder. They are concerned, because they said, whoa, you are asking for something and we have to go over there and ask them, okay, the very same government that we are dealing with here.

They go over, and I continue to call because usually it takes one or two days to get this kind of information. We call back between the 9th and the 16th. The Congressional Research Service spoke to the office of general counsel and was told the records are not complete.

Now, let me tell you something. The records are not complete of what? Wait. The subpoenas were given out. Obviously, the House general counsel had to have something to do with the subpoenas being issued.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You mean to tell me they did not keep track? They do not have a file?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. It gets better. Let me just tell you. Because it is so detailed between September 19 and September 29, the Congressional Research Service spoke to four House committees and was given the following response.

□ 1215

This is when you talk about the Potomac two step here. Someone is asking for records. Oh, my God. Well, people would assume here in the Congress that records is one of the things that we do so we know what we have done in the past, so that either we can do better in the future or not make the same mistake in the future. But here is the response: The committee does not have records. That was the first one. The other one: Committee does not have records of previous Congresses.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Wait. They do not keep records of previous Congresses?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. So we do not know what is going on under this majority.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. The next one is: The committee is not sure they have those records. They could be archived. And the fourth one: The committee does not have records for previous years, and previous records may be at the National Archives.

Now I am going to put the majority on notice right now. If those subpoenas, which I believe were sent out and issued under the Clinton administration, are in this Capitol, and I do not know of any subpoenas, but if they are out there, and I am going to give them the benefit of the doubt, if they are in this building, somebody better get an intern and run them over to the National Archives because we are on our way over there.

This issue of covering up this whole thing, this thing of I got your back if you have mine, enough of it. People want change. We are trying to bring about that change, and we are being stymied. We are being locked out of information.

One Member said, this is the people's House. I question that at this time. I question that because I think, and I am coming in for a landing here, I think there are some people that are very, very worried about the facts we are bringing to light to the American people and to Members of Congress, letting them know that we know what is going on in the back halls of Congress.

Right now, like I said before, as it relates to governance, the country is going through some hard times; and there are some folks on the majority side that are not willing to govern on behalf of the very Americans that sent us here to represent them.

In this House, we have to be elected. Not one Member of this House has been appointed. In the Senate, you can be appointed by a Governor if someone leaves early in their term. But in the House there has to be a special election. So whether it is Democrat or Republican, you are elected. There is one Independent. By virtue of the fact we have been elected to come here, we have been federalized to make sure we stand up on behalf of everyday Americans.

So the hypocrisy that is going on in the House as relates to oversight, I am saying this on behalf of CIA agents right now worrying about whether their government is going to out them, and I am saying this on behalf of national security, which I serve on two committees which deal with this very issue.

Our integrity and how other countries see us and how individuals that want to go into the clandestine service, that want to serve in the CIA, I want them, I want the best and brightest to come, but I do not want them to think or anyone in the State Department to think if they get on the opposite side of an administration that they will go after their wife.

We have not even talked about that. Because Ambassador Wilson had something to say outside of what was on the script of the White House, and they could not get him because he is a person that dotted his I's and crossed his T's, they decided to go after his wife. We are going to go after your wife.

To women in this country, you need to be concerned about that. Someone cannot get to your husband, but they are going to come after you. We need to disabuse ourselves of that.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Well, you bet your sweet bippy they are worried. They are worried you are asking for those documents. Because there are those on the other side of the aisle that would try to lead people to believe that we are just a bunch of malcontent Democrats who are standing on the floor complaining about something inconsequential. It is just the same old, same old. Not true.

Look at the reasoning and the motivation that was behind the outing of a covert CIA agent and of the planning and machinations that were going on in the White House to conceal and deceive the American people about what their plans were. It was all about making sure that they could have their way in going to war in Iraq. That is what it all boiled down to. And the consequences of that motivation are that now we have more than 2,000 American soldiers, men and women, who are dead, who lost their lives because this administration was hell-bent on being right, facts be damned.

It made no difference to them that all the evidence mounting showed that they were wrong, that there were no weapons of mass destruction. It was obvious there was no other reason to go into Iraq other than the President and his people decided we should, long before September 11. With all the documentation that has come out now pointing to the fact that, soon after the President was elected in 2000, it had been decided that they were going to go to war in Iraq, and what they have been doing for the last few years leading up to our entering Iraq and since then is assembling the facts around their decision.

Then subsequent to our entry into Iraq and it being discovered there were no weapons of mass destruction, in part because Joe Wilson went there to Niger and demonstrated factually that that was not the case, subsequently they have had to prevaricate. They have had to lie, because, oops, it was shown that not only were they wrong but they were deceitful.

Can you think of any more heinous an act than deceiving the American people and the world on the ultimate sacrifice that Americans are asked to make for their country?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentlewoman would yield, that is a tremendous point. They have deceived and misled the American people. Then, when the Democrats want to change things and try to take things in a new

direction, people say, well, we were all dealing with the same intelligence. So we say, well, let us go and look at the intelligence. When we say let us try to fix this problem together in a bipartisan way, because there is so much at stake here, we get stymied.

Senator REID had to shut the Senate down the other day on behalf of the American people so that we could get a good, solid overview of the intelligence. We are not saying this just to say it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. They have no respect for the American people. They have no respect for the American people. When you are willing to do anything and say anything to have your way, regardless of the consequences, that demonstrates that you have no respect for the people that you represent, for the people that sent you to Washington to do right by them.

As elected officials, the three of us and all our colleagues here who serve in this Chamber, who have stood for office, most of us many times, what we are doing when we go and put our name on that ballot and ask people to support us, we are asking them to put their faith and their trust in us. We are telling them that we respect their opinion, that we will honor their opinion.

People in America do not expect to always agree with what we do here. I know there are people in my district who sometimes agree with me and sometimes they do not agree with me. But what they have told me, and I know each of my colleagues have heard this same thing, they have told me, Debbie, I do not always agree with you, but at least I know you are up there fighting for what you believe in. I know that you have the utmost integrity. I know I can put my faith and trust in you and that you are always going to look me in the eye and tell me exactly how things are and tell me the truth.

There is no one in America that the President can look in the eye and say he has told them the truth. Because, although he specifically has not been accused of anything illegal, he specifically has not been accused of anything illegal, you are a reflection of the people you surround yourself with. And, essentially, by allowing Karl Rove to remain in the White House and by hanging on to his staff that have been accused of unethical behavior—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). The Chair must remind all Members that remarks in debate may not engage in personal offense toward the President by accusation or insinuation of wrongdoing.

The gentlewoman may proceed.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Forgive me, Mr. Speaker, but there are times when this is so outrageous and the conduct that is going on in this administration is so outrageous that it is difficult to contain myself and it is difficult to keep that outrage bottled up inside.

Because that is what we have been asking for weeks now. Where is the outrage? Where is the outrage from the Republican leadership in this Chamber? They certainly had plenty of outrage during the previous administration.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentlewoman will yield, this is not personal. Let us be absolutely clear about this. This is business. This is about the business of the American people.

When we have the Chief of Staff of the Vice President lie to a Grand Jury on two counts and of perjury, two counts of false statements to Federal agents and of obstruction of justice; when we have the Deputy Chief of Staff of the President lie to the American people on two separate occasions; when we have the Vice President of the United States knowingly make a comment to Scooter Libby that he knows about the ambassador's wife and then goes on Meet the Press and says he does not know, this is not about Democrat and Republican, this is about the future of the country.

This country is going in the wrong direction, and every ounce of energy in the White House is geared towards covering up the outing of a CIA agent. So this is not personal. This is about the 700,000 people we each represent and the 300 million people that are in this country. It is about the wage gap, the gap between rich and poor, the increased number of poor people in our society and the lack of an adequate response to the greatest natural disaster in the history of the country. That is about executing our constitutional obligation, our constitutional responsibility.

This is this is not personal, Mr. Speaker. This is not personal. This is about us as elected representatives in the United States Congress, who swear to uphold the Constitution, wanting to take the country in a new direction, wanting to change the way business is done down here and to get rid of the corruption and the cronyism and the incompetent leadership. That is what this whole thing is about. It is not personal.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. If the gentleman will yield, I can tell you why this is not personal. It is not personal for this Congress and it is not personal for the leadership, but it is personal to the American people. We have taxpayer dollars we are trying to nickel and dime. We want to nickel and dime Medicare, we want to nickel and dime Medicaid, we want to nickel and dime free and reduced lunches for poor people here in this country, and then we want to get excited about possibly saying something about someone in power?

We respect the rules of this House. We appreciate the integrity that is in the rules of this House. We do not want to abuse the rules of this House. But as it relates to the majority leadership and the majority on the other side and the majority in the Senate and as it relates to the White House, I want them

to live by the same rules that everyday Americans have to live by.

I want it to be personal for them just like it is personal for the person that can only afford to put \$10 in their gas tank because they do not even know what it means to have their gas tank full because gas prices are so high.

I want the folks that get driven around this place, that are being chauffeured around here in cars that do not know what it means not to put a debit card into a gas pump but only be able to get \$15 out, I want them to feel it just as personally.

I want them to feel personally what the mother who has to think about whether her son, who is living in the heart of America, and she may very well be in a trailer park, and because I was federalized, I represent her, too. I want them to feel personally the decision she is going to have to make when the budget is passed by this Republican majority controlled Congress cutting free and reduced lunches. That is personal. That is personal.

So I could care less about the folks of power and influence and what they say and how they do it. We are going to stay within the rules. We are going to stay within the rules, but I want to make sure that folks understand that we have individuals out in this country that are suffering, white, black, Native American, Hispanic.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Asian.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And Asian. They are suffering, and we have to give them voice. We have to give them voice, sure, when we start outing CIA agents, when we start seeing the majority side looking the other way. Even though they know what is going, they are not going to look because their friends are there and they do not want to do that.

In the Clinton administration, Democrats called the administration officials out on things that they were doing that was wrong.

□ 1230

That is our responsibility in the Constitution of these United States.

So when the gentleman from Ohio speaks of not putting party over country, I think that if we were to look at what we do now and what we have done in the past, we have always put country over party. The everyday Republican does not want his government operated by what the national GOP leadership says that it should be, that we need to do that and do this, but they are messing with the lives of everyday Americans. They do not endorse that.

So the problem here in this House is that we are sharing that information with the American people. We are not over at the Democratic National Committee sitting there sharing it with Democrats only. We are here sharing it with the American people; and we are letting the Members of this House, the majority and the minority, know that we all must go see the wizard and get some courage and some heart and

stand up to some of these very few individuals that are in the minority on the majority side that are running and pulling the sticks behind the curtains on behalf of the American people. Now, that is personal.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, what it boils down to is that here in the House the rules hem us in, and we have to talk around a lot of what we might like to say more directly, but the American people elected us to speak truth to power. I mean, that is the bottom line. We could not have more power in the White House than there is right now, and they exercise every bit of it. They exercise every bit of it, regardless of the consequences, regardless of the plight of the people whose decisions they affect. There are so many examples of how what we are doing on this floor allows us to reveal that truth.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) has a chart right there that will help us ferret out a little bit of that truth.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, our friend from Florida was talking about what is going on and how personal this is.

I mean, we have an obligation here. What is going on today is the Republican majority has created a welfare state. They have created a welfare state. They have created a welfare state here in the United States, but the welfare state is for a very small group, corporations. Sixteen billion dollars in the last few months of corporate welfare went to the oil companies, the most profitable quarters they have had in decades; and public tax money was given to the tune of \$16 billion to subsidize them. Pharmaceutical companies have gotten over \$100 billion in average people's tax money, sent down here. The Republican majority gave it to the pharmaceutical companies. So we have a welfare state in the United States of America.

But we also are creating a welfare state in Iraq. While we are cutting free and reduced lunch and Medicaid and Medicare, health care programs for United States citizens, we have opened up 110 primary health care centers in Iraq. We have educated 2,000 health officials. Three point two million kids in Iraq have been vaccinated. We have rehabbed 2,717 schools and trained 36,000 teachers.

Now maybe we should be doing this because we invaded the country and bombed the heck out of it. So maybe we should be doing it. But when they are giving billions to the wealthiest corporations in the country and they are cutting free and reduced lunch for kids and they are doubling the cost of college tuition and raising the fees for student loans to the tune of \$5,000 over the life of the loan, they are doing what is best for the Republican Party and they are doing the absolute worst

thing they could possibly do for the United States of America.

And let me tell the my colleagues why, Mr. Speaker. The Chinese government in the country of China produced 600,000 engineers last year. We produced 70,000, half of those engineers foreign born. How are we going to stimulate our economy, create new jobs, innovate the new technologies that are needed to be innovated so that we could keep on the cutting edge of a vibrant global economy if we are not investing into the very people who are going to create that wealth? We cannot ask poor, unhealthy, uneducated kids to go into the workforce and create wealth for us. But yet we are making the investment in Iraq and we are giving away billions in tax dollars to the oil companies and to the pharmaceutical companies.

That system is corrupt. That is a corrupt system. Corrupt. And the way it is being administered and the way government is being administered is at a level of incompetence that we have never really ever seen. With the war, the execution of the aftermath of the war, the rehab, the nation building, complete incompetence on behalf of the guys who wear the suits and ties. Complete incompetence.

The response to Katrina, the highest level of incompetence possible because they put people in charge of FEMA who were political cronies, and the level of cronyism in this administration is really higher than we have really ever seen. And they are not cronies because they know the administration. They are cronies because they get the job and they are not competent.

We all know if one gets a political job and they get to hire people that they are going to hire people they know because this is a business about loyalty. But we also have to hire people who are competent. And Mr. Brown, Brownie, ran an Arabian horse show or something like that, and then he is in charge of FEMA, the point person for emergencies in the United States?

Now this could have very well been a terrorist attack. There could have been explosives. There could have been bombs on the levees instead of a Category 4 hurricane. And our response would have had to have been the same, and it was not a good response. It was not an adequate response.

So the level of incompetency here is unreal. It is a corrupt system that takes care of corporations and ignores every other American. I just want to tell my colleagues it would be nice if someone on the other side, if someone in the Republican Party, would just stand up and take responsibility. We get lectured all the time about personal responsibility. Please someone stand up and take responsibility, because they are weakening the country. They are weakening the country. And we have a constitutional obligation to try to offer solutions.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. No.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield as I prepare to take responsibility?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. No, you guys have the floor all the time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I will take responsibility, and I am looking forward to it in just a couple of minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me.

I simply would like to say that when it comes to the issue of taking responsibility, we clearly are going to respond to the kinds of outrageous things that we have been hearing for the last few minutes about the state of the U.S. economy, about where we are headed as a Nation and about the kinds of challenges that we have and, quite frankly, about our desire to work in a bipartisan way to address these issues. So I am proud to take responsibility for these very important things.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, will the gentleman be willing to support an independent commission for Katrina, a bipartisan commission?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Let me just say right now we are very proud of the fact that we have put into place a committee that the Speaker of the House has established which has been interviewing, in fact, among others, Mike Brown, the gentleman just mentioned by my friend.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). The gentleman from Ohio controls the time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we want a commitment from the gentleman, if he is willing to take responsibility, to establish with us a bipartisan committee like the 9/11 Commission to oversee Katrina in which Democrats and Republicans both would agree and both have equal power in the commission like the 9/11 Commission.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, that is basically what has happened with the establishment of the committee which was put into place which was modeled after the committees that have looked at the October Surprise, that have looked at Iran-Contra, other issues that have come forward. We tried to put together a bicameral committee that was focused on it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate that, but the bottom line is this, my good friend from California: Your committee is controlled by the majority party. It

is not a bipartisan equal commission like the 9/11 Commission. The 9/11 Commission was the most successful commission we have had in trying to address a major terrorist attack in the United States. Let us put a bipartisan commission together and look at Katrina.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my friend that I believe that what we should do is we should take our constitutional responsibility, our constitutionally mandated responsibility according to Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, for oversight of the executive branch. We should pursue that as vigorously as we possibly can.

And I will say to my friend, that if, in fact, after doing that, having Democrats and Republicans work in a bipartisan way on the commission that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) is chairing, if we do not see the kind of information that we knew, if we do not see the kind of scrutiny that we all believe should be applied in looking at the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, I will support the gentleman's motion of putting together that bipartisan commission.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time, you are leaving all of the decision-making power in the hands of the 11 Republican Members.

Mr. DREIER. Let me just say, no, we are not doing that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio controls the time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the way the committee is set up right now, there are 11 Republicans and there are 9 Democrats on the committee. The Democratic Party cannot subpoena a witness without the support of the Republican Party. We cannot subpoena the documents. We cannot get the kind of information that we need without the approval of the majority party, and you are asking the American people to trust the Republican Party, the same people that appointed Brownie to run FEMA, and he is still on the payroll.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to respond to that by saying very simply that it is not the work of the Republicans or the Democrats. It is the work of the committee. It is up to the committee to make a determination as to whether or not someone was subpoenaed.

Now you have referred to him, using the same terminology that the President referred to Michael Brown as, which I understand is "Brownie." Did he or did he not appear before that bipartisan committee that was established by Speaker HASTERT?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, he did. But the same party that is overseeing him has left

this man on the payroll making \$148,000 a year.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentleman from California, you are the chairman of the Rules Committee. You spend as much time restricting the Democrats' ability to offer amendments and act in a bipartisan fashion and provide input to the policies that are forced through this Congress than anyone else in this Chamber. There is absolutely no bipartisan effort made here.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Let me just say that that is completely untrue. Of the amendments that have been made in order in this Congress, 161 of the amendments reported out of the Rules Committee have been either Democratic amendments or bipartisan amendments; 143 of the amendments have been Republican amendments. More amendments have been made in order that were either bipartisan or offered by Democrats than Republicans. So it is a specious argument that my friend has made.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we are getting into some procedural stuff here, but the Republican Party does not need to offer amendments because they get everything they want into the bill during the committee process. They offer it. They do not need to offer amendments.

□ 1245

THE FAVORABLE ECONOMIC GROWTH IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this Special Order out to talk about a number of very specific issues, and I would like to begin by referencing an article that I read earlier this week in *Agence France*, the publication, and that article had to do with the issue of outsourcing.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago at this time we had people in the mainstream media, we had commentators all over the United States referring to the issue of outsourcing. There was a sense somehow that Americans were losing their jobs en masse. Why? Because their jobs were all going to Mexico, their jobs were all going to other countries in Latin America, their jobs were all going to China, their jobs were going to India, their jobs were going to Pakistan; and we have continued to hear

time and time again that the issue of outsourcing is one which is wiping out and devastating the U.S. economy.

Well, this article to which I have referred was reporting the fact that outsourcing, outsourcing, has actually created a net increase in jobs here in the United States. This report found that offshore outsourcing resulted in the creation of more than 419,000 jobs, compared to the 162,000 technology jobs that have been displaced from the United States. So when people look at the fact that, yes, some jobs have gone overseas, they forget to look at the fact that we have had a surge in job creation that is in fact a by-product of so-called outsourcing. The chief economist at Global Insight said no one is denying that there are job losses, but the net effect is that you create more jobs than you lose.

So I think it is a very important point, Mr. Speaker. My friends who were just talking on the other side of the aisle are among those who cry the loudest when they refer to this issue of outsourcing. Again, we are not saying there has not been some displacement. Change is inevitable. But one of the arguments I like to make on this, Mr. Speaker, is that the United States of America is providing the global leadership that we need when it comes not only militarily and geopolitically, but economically; and if we do not shape that global economy, the United States of America will be shaped by it.

So when we have hand-wringing over outsourcing, we, of course, are saddened that anyone would possibly see the shift of a job. But as the chief economist at Global Insight said, no one is denying that there are job losses, but the net effect is that you create more jobs. That report concluded that the net benefit to the U.S. gross domestic product from outsourcing and a stronger economy was over \$68 billion in 2005 alone, \$68 billion. By 2010, this net effect will rise to over \$147 billion.

Now, I am pointing to this issue, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that I have listened to these arguments that are being made by my friends on the other side of the aisle that the United States of America is going to hell in a handbasket, is basically what they are arguing, and that the United States economy is devastated, we are not competitive, we are not creating jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder what kind of world I am living in when elected representatives of the American people can come to that kind of conclusion. It is absolutely preposterous. It is outrageous that anyone could come to a conclusion like that.

Why? A week ago today, Mr. Speaker, a week ago today we got the report that the U.S. economy in the last quarter grew at a rate of 3.8 percent, 3.8 percent GDP growth. That is a very impressive figure, a very impressive figure by any standard. But it is an incredible figure when you look at what it was up against.

One of the worst days in our Nation's history will have been just 2 months

ago when we saw what has been described as the worst natural disaster to ever hit the United States, that being, of course, Hurricane Katrina. Then we have seen Hurricane Rita and Hurricane Wilma. And what happened when these disasters hit, and our thoughts and prayers continues to be with all of those who were victimized by those horrible natural disasters, but when we heard the news and saw the pictures of this devastation, what was the sense that most people had? This is going to be a solid blow at the U.S. economy. It is going to really, really hurt the U.S. economy.

The projections were that as soon as numbers began to come in on the issue of the impact of Hurricane Katrina, there would be a net job loss in the United States of 200,000, maybe even higher than that.

Then we got the report from the payroll survey. Tragically, 35,000 was the net job loss, according to the payroll survey. That is not great news. But when you look at the fact that we had just shouldered the worst natural disaster in our Nation's history, it was incredibly positive news.

Then when you look at the household survey, which is a much better gauge, a much better gauge because it takes into account small businessmen and -women, those who are self-employed, a lot of people in especially the biotech industry who are not included in the traditional establishment payroll survey, the household survey found a great surge of about a quarter of a million net jobs gained during that period of time since Hurricane Katrina.

So as I listen to my colleagues say that we are running the United States of America into the ground and that our country is in deep trouble, it is just a mischaracterization. I know we have challenges. I read the newspaper. I watch television. I experience going to California, listening and talking to people from all across this country, looking at our challenges internationally, looking at what is going on in Iraq, looking at the fact that we are daily fighting the global war on terror. I recognize that we have serious problems.

But, Mr. Speaker, one of the most important things that we can do in dealing with every single one of those problems is make sure the U.S. economy continues to grow.

The other day I shared an anecdote of an experience I had just a few weeks after Hurricane Katrina hit. I was visiting my family in my original hometown of Kansas City, Missouri, and was out having lunch on a Sunday. I talked to one of the people working there, and I said, Well, how has business been? And this man said to me, I don't know. I have only worked here for a few days.

I said, Oh, really? Okay.

He said, I was the chef at Brennan's in New Orleans, and my entire family has been able to move here to Kansas City, Missouri. We are staying with other family members. We like it here.

I have this job here now, and we are very grateful for that. The point being that the overall strength of the U.S. economy has been able to deal with the challenge of 1.2 million of our fellow Americans who were displaced and devastated by these natural disasters.

So that is why I argue, Mr. Speaker, that as we look at how we deal with the aftermath of the hurricane, the single most important thing we can do for everyone involved is to ensure that we continue the growth of the U.S. economy.

Now, thinking back to some of the arguments I heard just a few minutes ago from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they were talking about our deficit reduction bill we are going to be voting on here next week.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to be voting on that measure. Why? Because we know very well that reforming government, doing everything that we can to reform our Nation's government, to ensure that those who are truly in need are able to receive the assistance necessary, but at the same time making sure that those who are not truly in need and those who do not qualify, those who abuse the system, areas where we see waste and fraud, that we tackle those.

Mr. Speaker, we are poised with the deficit reduction bill that we are going to work on next week to do just that.

I listened to my friend on the other side of the aisle talk about the fact that we are going to be throwing starving people out into the streets, preventing people from getting educations and doing all of these things. Once again, nothing could be further from the truth.

We are looking at the issue of Medicaid, a program that is designed to provide health care for those who are truly in need. They will be talking about this over the weekend and next week as the debate proceeds on our Deficit Reduction Act, and they will say that we want to pull the rug out from under people who are very much in need.

Mr. Speaker, while I believe sincerely as a Republican that the Federal Government should be the last source to which people look for assistance, we do have a Medicaid program that is in place, and not one of us wants to do anything to see someone who is desperately in need hurt. But when we have those who are not desperately in need, who abuse the system, it is something that needs to be addressed; and that is exactly what this legislation is all about.

My friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) who chairs the Energy and Commerce Committee, has gone into great detail, and he will next week, about the Medicaid provisions. They came from his committee.

Right now, the rate of growth of spending in the area of Medicaid is 7.3 percent a year. By looking at these reforms, the measure that we are going to be voting on next week will provide

an increase in Medicaid spending of 7 percent. Not 7.3 percent, 7 percent. Three-tenths of one percent. That simply is slowing the rate of growth of spending in this program. So the notion that somehow we want to turn our backs on people who are in need is just plain wrong and inaccurate.

Now, in looking at these reforms, what do we want to do? We want to take issues like asset dumping. Asset dumping is a scenario whereby people will take their home, which has a great deal of value, and they will get rid of that home. Why? So that they can qualify for this Medicare program that is designed to assist the indigent, the very poor. Having someone with an asset of half a million dollars benefit from basically a welfare program was never the intent of the Medicaid program at all, but there are people who are doing that now. So it is our goal to ensure that people who are truly, truly in need, will be the ones who receive this much-needed assistance.

Mr. Speaker, a lot is going to be said about these issues; and I believe when we look at our Deficit Reduction Act, our goal is, as I like to say, Mr. Speaker, not simply to try and reduce spending by \$50 billion, if that is what the number ends up being. Of course, those are savings for the American people. Our goal is to try to work and bring the deficit down. Democrats and Republicans alike decry deficit spending. That is something that is great. That is something we want to work on in a bipartisan way. That is what this Deficit Reduction Act is about. I hope Democrats will join with us in support of this measure to reduce the deficit by passing the Deficit Reduction Act.

It is not simply about dollars; it is about the reach of the Federal Government. I have been listening over the last few days to some horror stories of the kinds of things that the government does. Many of those things discourage individual initiative and responsibility.

It brought to mind for me 1996 and 1997 when we were working very hard to pass important welfare reform. We know, Mr. Speaker, that we have seen a generational cycle of welfare, going back to the much lauded and very well intended Great Society of Lyndon Baines Johnson. We have seen trillions of dollars, trillions of dollars, spent on perpetuating the welfare state, and yet the level of poverty has continued in this country in many areas. Why? Because it has been a generational cycle of welfare.

So in 1996 and 1997, we began the effort to alter that, to change that generational cycle of dependence; and we passed welfare reform.

I can remember instances where people who have been receiving for generations welfare, they have been discouraged from working because of their dependence on Federal Government assistance, that many of these people were, because of our reforms, able to move to the working side of the economy rather than being on the receiving

side of the economy; and, Mr. Speaker, they have been able to be self-sufficient, they have been able to support their families.

But the most important thing, the most important thing, and I will never forget a woman from Long Beach, California, that talked about this, she had the pride back that she had lost. She had the pride back that she had lost for generations because of the fact that she was now able to be on the productive side of the U.S. economy.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, I think that we should do all that we can to continue encourage more and more Americans to be on the productive side of the economy. And I have to say that we have the highest number of Americans working today. One hundred forty-two million Americans are working. Never before in the United States of America have we had so many Americans who are working. We have what has been traditionally considered to be full employment.

The news just came out: The unemployment rate remains steady at 5.1 percent. Well, that 5.1 percent is lower than the average rate for unemployment through the decade of the 1970s, the 1980s, and the much-heralded 1990s.

Years ago, full employment for the United States was considered to be 6 percent. If you had a 6 percent unemployment rate, it basically meant that every American who wanted to work and could work was working. Today, we have a 5.1 percent unemployment rate. So this notion that somehow the U.S. economy has gone to hell in a hand basket is again just plain wrong. You cannot only anecdotally but you can factually look at this.

That is not to say that there are not people in the United States who are facing challenges, who are facing problems, who are facing difficulties. That has existed since the beginning of time, and we will always be expending time and effort trying to encourage people to work for themselves, and we will constantly try to put into place policies that will assist people in that goal of trying to be self-sufficient and to work and all.

Mr. Speaker, as I look at these challenges, what is it that we can do to keep this economy growing? Well, there are a lot of things that we can do. Making sure that we make permanent those important, important measures that repeal the marriage tax penalty, that provides for the per child tax credit, a critically important thing, and at the same time recognize that we must have growth-oriented tax cuts.

Now, as I stand here in this well, I am thinking about just the last few years when Members on the other side of the aisle said to us: If we cut taxes, the U.S. economy is going to go right down the drain and the U.S. budget deficit, our Federal deficit, will go sky high.

Mr. Speaker, we have cut taxes, we have put into place the very, very im-

portant growth-oriented tax cuts for dividends and capital gains, and what is it that has happened? We have seen a surge of revenues, to the point where the Federal budget deficit has been improving. We have gotten basically a \$108 billion spending reduction by virtue of the fact that the increased flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury has reduced the Federal deficit from the February projection by \$108 billion.

Now that came as a shock to many people, and unfortunately many of my friends on the other side of the aisle have failed to even recognize that. When they said, if you cut taxes, the economy will go into the tank and the deficit will go sky high, the exact opposite has happened. Our economy has surged to this very low unemployment rate, virtually full employment, tremendous numbers of jobs being created, fewer people on welfare and depending on the government for their sources of survival, and a reduction in the deficit itself.

So these are things that, frankly, are real, Mr. Speaker. These are things that are out there, and these are things that the American people should understand.

We will next week vote on this deficit reduction measure, and it will be mischaracterized. But, Mr. Speaker, the deficit reduction measure that we are putting into place designed to decrease the size of our deficit, cut Federal spending, and diminish that cycle of dependence on government and the reach of government is absolutely critical to our goal of sustaining economic growth. All of the benefits to which I referred over the last few minutes are there because of the strong economy, and next week's vote for deficit reduction will be a vote that will play a big role in seeing the U.S. economy continue to move boldly and dynamically into the 21st century.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect of economic growth that I think is very important. At this moment, the President of the United States and 34, all 34 of the democratically elected leaders in this hemisphere are in Argentina at the very important meeting of the Summit of the Americas. President Bush is there talking about a very important component of U.S. economic growth, and that happens to be the goal of establishing a free trade area of Americas within this hemisphere.

Back in November of 1979, when Ronald Reagan announced that he was a candidate for the President of the United States, he envisaged this accord of free trade among all the Americas; and he was laughed at by many. Just the notion of establishing a free trade agreement with Canada, with Mexico was something people thought impossible.

Mr. Speaker, it did take a long period of time, but we in 1993 did pass the North American Free Trade Agreement. We just 3 months ago passed the Central American Free Trade Agreement, building on the success of the

North American Free Trade Agreement.

And I know that my friends on the other side of the aisle will say the North American Free Trade Agreement has devastated the economy. Every ailment, every ailment of society, every single problem that we face is because of the North American Free Trade Agreement. I hear that constantly. Again, it is important to look at the numbers.

The top priority for us: Border security, and national security. Border security is a very important part of national security. Economic growth in Latin America is essential to our stemming the flow of people coming illegally from Latin America and other parts of the world into the United States. Mr. Speaker, were it not for the North American Free Trade Agreement, more than a few people have told me that the problem of illegal immigration would be twice as bad as it is today were it not for the North American Free Trade Agreement.

I know how serious it is. I am privileged to represent California here and will tell you that the problem of illegal immigration is a very, very important issue for us to address. And we are addressing it. I have legislation, H.R. 98, that calls for the establishment of a counterfeit-proof Social Security card so that the magnet of jobs that draws people illegally into the United States will not be able to be utilized because people will have a counterfeit-proof Social Security card, rather than using the 94 different documents that today are used by people here illegally, fraudulently in cases, to get jobs.

Making sure that we do all that we can to continue to see the economy in this hemisphere grow is important. That is what President Bush is doing right now. As we see that growth, economic growth in Latin America, again, that will help us deal with the problem of border security.

People come to this country, 98 percent of them at least, for one reason and one reason only, looking for jobs, looking to feed their families. We all know that. Everyone acknowledges that. So if we can see job opportunities throughout Latin America, it will lead people to do what they would rather do and that is stay in their home countries.

So what has happened now? Because of the trade that we have seen take place between our two countries, we have seen the economies of both Mexico and other countries in Latin America and the United States grow. In fact, a third of \$1 trillion in cross-border trade takes place between Mexico and the United States.

I know that there has been this constant sense that there are only very rich or very poor in Mexico. You are either a multi-billionaire or you are impoverished. Not many people recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the middle-class population in Mexico is larger than the entire Canadian population, and it is

growing. There are more people moving into that middle class in Mexico, and that is in large part because of the trade relationship between the United States and Mexico and the elimination of tariff and non-tariff barriers that are taking place within the region with things like passage of the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, as you look at the challenges that we have here at home, it really sickens me that people mischaracterize the positive things that have taken place. I do not diminish the problems that we have in any way. I do not diminish them at all. But I will say that we do have a lot that needs to be done, but we also have a lot of great things that have been done. It is imperative that, as we deal with these challenges that are out there, that we do not in fact eliminate the very positive steps that have been taken to see us have the success that we are enjoying in the global war on terror, see us enjoy the kind of prosperity that is enjoyed across the United States of America.

With that, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I look forward anxiously to our passage of the Deficit Reduction Act next week, and I hope the Democrats will join with us in that goal.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we want to thank the democratic leadership for allowing us to be here and for this hour, and we want to continue talking about the issues that we were talking about in the hour before the last one, the issues that are facing Americans. As you know, within our working group we talk about what we are doing and what the other side is doing or not doing and how we want to put this country and build a partnership, put it on a new direction. The only way we will be able to do that is making sure that we are able to get some of the ideas on this side of the aisle to the forefront, make sure that we work in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I must say that that is not happening right now on a lot of the major issues, issues that are facing everyday Americans, issues as it relates to the budget that is coming to this floor next week. I can tell you that this so-called budget was put together on the backs of everyday working Americans. Some may say that it was in light of making sure that we can respond to Hurricane Katrina and the gulf coast, but cutting the very assistance that these individuals need is almost like saying I am going to take \$5 out of this pocket and then I am going to try to put it, the same \$5 I took out of your pocket, and put it in your left pocket and we are done. That is not good enough.

I think it is very, very important to also be mindful of the fact: If the job is so good here in Congress, if we are doing everything that we are supposed to do as it relates to the American people and they feel so good about the economy, they feel so good about security, they feel so good about health care, they feel so good about the environment, then why do American people, poll after poll polls this Congress at a 35 percent approval rating? Thirty-five percent.

I mean, if I was to call down to my district and they were to take a poll on how they felt about me and it was 35 percent, that means that I need to start doing something right for me to be reelected to this Congress.

So when we start, our friends on the opposite side of the side come in and say, well, we are doing a great job and I do not know what the problem, and folks are saying that we are not, and I hope our friends on the other side starts to join us. I can tell you right now, I do not want to join anything where the American people feel that you are doing a great job by 35 percent. That is not a team I want to be on.

If I am going to go join a team or be a part of something, I am going to be a part of a winning team. I am going to be a part of a team that is going to make sure that we stand up on behalf of everyday Americans, that makes sure that we do not have States out there with over \$85 billion in deficits, deficits that they have to clear up, they have to balance, unlike this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the Members, last night I brought this chart out and I just want to remind once again, because I want to make sure that Members understand, American people understand, Mr. Speaker, this is not the doing of the Democrats. This is the doing of the Republican majority. Forty-two Presidents. Forty-two. And this is from the U.S. Department of Treasury. This is not the Kendrick Meek Report. U.S. Department of Treasury of the United States of America, in case anyone gets confused. Forty-two Presidents, all the way from the Whig Party before we had Republicans and Democrats. Since 1776 to the year 2000, Democrats and Republicans, Whig Party and other parties alike, 42 Presidents only borrowed \$1.01 trillion from foreign nations, from foreign countries. One, one President with the majority here in this House, Republican majority and in the Senate, has trumped 42 Presidents, 42 Presidents, \$1.05 trillion and counting.

□ 1315

So we bring to the floor the issues at hand. These issues are real, and it is the reality of America right now. And so when our friends on the other side start saying, I do not know what is going on, I have a job, I think everybody else does, I think everything is okay, somebody needs to go out and tell the American people that it is

okay, because they do not think it is okay.

Thirty-five percent of Americans feel that we are doing an okay job. What does that mean? That means a number of Americans feel that we are not doing the job that we are supposed to be doing, whatever that may be.

I just want to go back again, Mr. Speaker, in case a Member was walking around, had a phone call or something, did not quite understand. Forty-two Presidents, you name it, they are here, 1776 to 2000, 224 years, 224 years. In the 224 years, they did not borrow from foreign governments as much as one President and the majority Republicans here in this House have done.

The President did not do it on his own. 224 years, Mr. Speaker, World War I, World War II, Vietnam, Korea, other crises in the country, depressions, you name it. Things that my grandmother and my father told me about took place in the time of these 42 Presidents.

Under this one President, one majority, they helped us get to this number. So you know, the facts may hurt. The facts hurt. The facts hurt when you sit down at the dining room table trying to figure out how you are going to get past this month dealing with the money that you are making.

Now, how are you going to get past this month? Those are hard facts. Well, the hard facts are, like it or not, it is not, you know, not the 30-something Working Group; it is not, you know, the Democrats. It is prepared and served by the majority here in this House, and the majority in the Senate and the White House; and that is a fact, Jack.

I do not care. You can go and use big words, you can go around, read reports that someone gave you that kind of paint the pot black with the fact that a lot of people out there use a lot of numbers, charts and graphs; but the bottom line is we are borrowing our country away to foreign nations.

Then we want to call a budget up on the backs of the very people that we say that we are trying to help.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And the money we are borrowing, this is the ultimate irony of the whole deal, and this is why we say that I did not hear our friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), when he was down here take responsibility for that. It was conspicuously absent from the argument.

The most ironic piece of this whole ordeal is that that money that we are borrowing from China and Saudi Arabia and Japan is going to fund \$16 billion in subsidies to the oil companies. That money that we are borrowing from China is going to subsidize the pharmaceutical industry to the tune of \$100 billion.

So the MO of the Republican majority is to go borrow money from the Chinese and take that money and give it to corporate America, and then go to corporate America and shake them

down, go out to shakedown street on K Street, shake down corporate America for campaign contributions to run the election, and the group that is absent here, the American people.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Our good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), was defending the Republican leadership's position here that they are committed to cutting the deficit, and that that is, you know, a major reason why next week they are going to rain down these horrendous terrible cuts in the budget on the people who are the most in need.

I was not very good at math when I was younger. But you know, the most simplistic mathematical calculation would tell you that if they are going to cut \$50 billion out of the budget next week, yet still provide \$70 billion worth of tax cuts, than I guess I just wonder how they are going to reduce the deficit when you are still adding \$20 billion to it.

I mean, and then that is to say nothing of the fact that when you cut the budget, you are doing nothing to reduce the deficit. That is just what is so mind-boggling.

I think if we can, I would like to translate, because words like deficit and reconciliation and big Washington-speak words like that are sometimes hard for regular folks in our districts to understand, so let us talk about what this reconciliation budget-cut document that we are going to take up next week, what it really means for people.

In the Agriculture Committee, they voted to cut \$844 million from the food stamp program, which would kick 300,000 families out of the program and leave 40,000 children ineligible for free school lunches. Now, that is not whining. That means a little boy or little girl is going to have a grumbly tummy day after day.

Do you know what it feels like? I know what it feels like to not have anything in my tummy. I do not have anything in my tummy right now. But I have the ability to go out and buy a sandwich. People who get free and reduced school lunches do not have that luxury.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. These are children. It goes beyond empty tummies. It goes down to kids prepared and ready to learn regardless of their economic background. It is not their fault. It is not their fault that they are in a poor household and they are eligible, eligible because the Federal Government has found, and an education committee and all of these folks came about during a time here in this Congress and said, you know, kids that are coming to school hungry, we cannot actually teach them in the way that we want to. They are thinking about food. We need them thinking about preparing themselves to become the next workforce here in America.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The next entrepreneur, the next business person, the next person that is going to go out and

create wealth. And that is the whole thing with the Democrats. We are trying to convince the Republican Party that together America can do better for all of us.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Where is their moral outrage? Where are their morals? That is what I want to know. I am a mom. I have three little kids. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) has two young children.

Can you imagine a circumstance where you would allow your children to go hungry if you could do something about it? Our role here as Members of Congress, we are supposed to look out for the people who cannot look out for themselves. That is what government is for.

Children are our most vulnerable citizens. Laws are written and government exists so that we can take care of kids because they cannot make their parents earn enough money to be able to pay for their breakfast and their lunch. That is where we come in. That is where government fills in for the individuals, society.

It is not fathomable to me. When I gave birth to my children, my life transformed overnight. Overnight. In a matter of hours. And my whole life became not about me any more, or my day-to-day needs; but about their day-to-day needs. That is why we are here, because we are supposed to be taking care of the needs of people who cannot do it for themselves.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think there is a tremendous, huge magnificent moral component to this that our friends who in many instances invoke their religion to pass legislation tend to forget when it is dealing with the poor in our society. They forget their religion. But there is also an economic argument here.

We talked in the last hour about the Chinese producing 600,000 engineers. And the country of India, producing 350,000 engineers, and the United States only producing 70,000 engineers. The reason the Democrats are fighting for the free and reduced lunch program and student loans and increased funding for Pell grants and Medicaid is because we need healthy educated kids so that they can go to college and become engineers and create wealth so that we can keep this great democracy alive.

This is not just a moral argument. It is. But it is not just a moral argument. This is an economic argument. Who do we suppose is going to come up with the next alternative energy source? Who do we suppose is going to come up with the next great invention that is going to lead to more manufacturing in the United States of America, if we are not educating everybody?

In our cities, my friends, when we have 75 percent of our kids who live in our cities living in poverty, they are never going to be on the economic playing field for us. And we need 11 on both sides of the ball, my good friend. We need linebackers and cornerbacks and strong safeties and linemen. We

need quarterbacks and running backs and tight ends. And when they only educate half, you are losing, you are walking onto the field with only half a team.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I can tell the gentleman that when we start talking about what is happening here, and I think the problem here within the Beltway, the fact that we are here on this floor, or there is a report in the newspaper, whichever newspaper it may be, they do not know what they are talking about, because the majority sees everything in their world, everything is fine.

I am going to tell you the reason why we are here, Mr. Speaker, is Republicans permitted Democrats to offer only 4 percent of the amendments submitted to major legislation in the 108th Congress. And when this Congress is over, and we get the statistics on that, we will probably find the same. On prescription drugs, the energy bill and the tax bill, only 4 percent. So much for bipartisanship.

To shift the debate, for example, in the summer, the Republicans brought the consideration of amendments that drastically shaped three important measures before Congress. When you start looking at the issue of CAFTA, medical malpractice, and the Chinese trade, these amendments were not even allowed to be heard on the floor, or were limited and restricted. We are talking about bipartisanship. We talked about the Katrina Commission in the hour before last.

They do not want an independent commission like the 9/11 commission that the country was pleased with because it was bipartisan, and it was out of the reach of this Congress. They know the reason why we passed the 9/11 bill is because we had an independent 9/11 Commission that was able to have equal subpoena power, getting the facts.

Guess what? Democrats, Republicans, Independents, those who do not even vote in this country applauded it, the work that that entity, the 9/11 Commission, brought about. So to say that we have a partisan commission here in the House of Representatives does not serve the American people in the way that they should be served. We talked about that for months.

Right now I want to yield to you, because we do have a special guest here with us, and a great Member of this House. I want to you introduce him.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would like to introduce one of my mentors in Congress, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), an outstanding leader on a variety of issues, a recent Member of the Ways and Means Committee, a former quarterback at East Hartford High School.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlemen from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) for yielding me time and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and her colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) as well.

Mr. Speaker, you know, constituents back in my district have written us. And they have talked about listening to your voices, because truly you have struck a cord with America. More often than not, we go home and we hear from people, why are the Democrats not speaking out, or we do not seem to hear the Democratic message.

Well, frankly, in a one-party town, where the Presidency and all of the attendant agencies are controlled by the Republicans, where the House has been in control by the Republicans for more than a decade and where they control the Senate and are now putting a further ideological grip on the Supreme Court, it is in fact a one-party town.

As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) pointed out, when Democrats even try to get an amendment put to the floor, the heavy-handed Republican majority makes sure that no issues of consequence are voted on in this Chamber.

Time and time again, the Democratic message is squelched. You have used the analogy, I have heard throughout, of football. And sometimes when people ask about the Democratic message, the best offense is a good defense.

□ 1330

What stands between this ownership society juggernaut of privatization that they want to foist on the American public is the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and the Democratic party. However underfinanced, however squashed by the heavy-handed Republican majority, we continue to speak out in our only venue that we can, the public venue; and that is why people from my district have applauded the efforts that all of you have made.

You know, Roosevelt said it best of our colleagues. They are frozen in the ice of their own indifference. It is that indifference that troubles the American people. You have pointed out how we are basically prevented from working in a bipartisan fashion. But what is even more disturbing is when you reach out to this administration, whether you are mothers and fathers waiting outside in Crawford, Texas, and you find there is indifference to your sons and daughters who have given up their lives, or whether you are on the rooftops of New Orleans and there is indifference to your pleas for help, or whether you have to go to Canada to get prescription drugs because there is indifference to the kind of need that you have, indifference to the kind of energy needs that you will have this winter, it is that indifference that has consumed this body.

But because of voices like yours, and I commend each and every one of you, the American public is listening, and there will be a change in the ballot box come 2006 because this message is going to be heard.

Yes, we are on the defensive because we have to deal with this enormous juggernaut in Orwellian fashion that continues to perpetrate its message, a

false message, a message of false hope and false opportunity, and the only push-back that they are getting are from the voices of Democrats like yourself.

I commend each and every one of you, and I thank you for your continued efforts on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON). He is incredibly eloquent, and I tremor following that eloquence.

I want to just follow up with some specifics, because our good friend from California (Mr. DREIER) was here earlier challenging our description of our inability to make an impact and offer our ideas here. He described this mythological bipartisan process. Well, let us counter some of the facts he threw out there.

There have been 85 pieces of legislation that have had rules applied to them. For those who are listening that do not know what that means, we have restrictions placed on our ability as Members to offer amendments and offer our own ideas and help shape legislation every time, almost every time a bill is introduced on the floor. There have been 85 such bills that have been introduced.

Of those, 38 of them have had restrictive rules, meaning the Committee on Rules decides which, if any, amendments we are going to be allowed to offer. Fifteen of those rules, 15 individual pieces of legislation, have been entirely closed, meaning no Member is allowed to offer any amendments whatsoever. Three additional closed rules were added into an entirely separate bill. Of the 85 pieces of legislation that have come on this floor that have had rules apply to them, there has only been one substantive bill that had an open rule, meaning any Member can offer, meaning any Member elected in our own right, each by the same 633,000 people that we all represent, only one substantive bill has had an open rule where we can offer any amendment and any idea that we would like to offer.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is also the gentlewoman from Florida's (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) voice that stood out almost singularly when again the heavy-handed control of this Republican-dominated majority tried to foist the Terry Schiavo incident upon us. I thank the gentlewoman for your strong voice at that time. It was resounding all across this Nation. It was picked up by the Hartford Current editorial board, to name just a few of the people it has impacted.

The gentlewoman is right. It is not only specifically we can cite but it is the anecdotes that we can understand. I waited in the Rules Committee until 4 o'clock in the morning to try to get a bill that would provide for the Secretary of Health and Human Services

to be able to do the same thing that every other nation does for its seniors, and that is to negotiate directly with the pharmaceutical companies.

There is no way on that Medicare bill that that is not a germane piece of legislation, but it was denied access to the floor because of the power of its ideas.

When the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) suggests that we do not have ideas, we have many ideas. The ideas are squashed by the heavy-handed Republican majority here. So, therefore, there was not a vote that had taken place that would allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate directly with pharmaceutical companies so that our senior citizens could get the same kind of benefits and discounts, frankly, that the veterans do through the VA administration here.

But in the first 100 days the Democrats take back this Chamber, that is the kind of change the American public can expect to see; and that is why I am so proud of your efforts that you have been doing on a regular basis on this floor. Believe me, it is working. Because people are hearing all across this country. We refuse to be drowned out by the Republican majority and their Republican message machine, a network that is vast and large. And whether it is Pat Robertson's 700 Club or whether it is Rush Limbaugh or Cal Thomas or whether it is the Kato Institute or the Heritage Foundation or all the other entities that converge in synchronized and coordinated fashion to try to stifle your voice, you have stood up and spoke for America. God bless you. God bless America.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman just said. I did not know the gentleman was the one who tried to offer the amendment. It is good for the 30-Somethings to understand to put a face with the idea.

That idea to just negotiate down drug prices on a \$700 billion prescription drug bill, now that may save 10 percent, that may save 20 percent, some people would say that would save 30 percent. Let us say, for the sake of argument, that we could save 20 percent of a \$700 billion bill. That is \$140 billion that we would have here to either return back to the middle class in the form of middle-class tax cuts or to fully fund student loans or to fully fund the Pell grant or No Child Left Behind. \$140 billion goes a pretty long way, and that is what the Democrats want to do.

We have a Member here who is willing to sit in committee until 4:00 in the morning to try to get that provision tacked on to the bill, and you get shot down.

But we are here to say that we are fighting on behalf, and I was telling my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), earlier, there is an old Irish saying, Is this a private fight or can anyone get in it? And I believe that is what the mentality of the 30-Something group. We are ready to scrap

here. We are not going to sit back and let anyone push us around and let anyone tell us that we do not have ideas. Because we do have ideas. And just because the Republican majority does not like them, just because it may be contrary to their fund-raising opportunities, that does not mean we are going to stop.

I have to go catch a plane, and I am sorry about that because I would love to sit here and continue this discussion. But let me say, in closing, that the Democratic party wants to take this country into a new direction. We want to change the way things are going in Washington right now, and that is part of what this is all about. We also want to say to the American people that when you put us in charge, we are going to put the interests of the country before the interests of our own party.

The system that we just talked about where the pharmaceutical companies are getting middle-class taxes, they come to Washington and it returns to the oil companies and to the pharmaceutical companies, that system is inherently corrupt. And that when our Republican majority friends appoint someone who is in charge of an Arabian horses outfit to run FEMA, we are going to end the cronyism, and we are going to end the incompetence and the incompetent way they govern. We want to take the country in a new direction.

I thank my friends. I thank my friends. I thank my friends.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) as they depart, I just want to say what they are saying is right on. We do not have to be concerned with what outside people and outside groups say and do. We must be concerned about what our colleagues are doing or not doing on the other side. I think it is very important for us to remember that.

Talking about this budget is something that really needs review. And I encourage the American people, I also encourage Members to figure out what is in it and what is not in it. The cuts that are being made in the budget, well, let us just call it what it is.

Let me ask the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), I know she has a third-party validator, the cuts that are in this budget, in the light of hurricane relief, the cuts that are being made are really to clear the way for the \$106 billion tax cut mainly for special interests and billionaires in this country on the backs of Medicare, on the backs of Medicaid, on the backs of free and reduced lunch for children.

And the reason why they were on the backs of those, and some may call it dependency, I call it making sure that the seniors can get their prescription drugs. I call it making sure that children that happen to be born into a poor community and in a poor family and a struggling family that is trying to make way to get a hot meal in the

morning, to be able to get lunch, I guess left up to the majority since there is something about this dependency thing that is going on, I guess it is okay to have 60 percent of the kids eating lunch and 40 percent of the kids looking outside of the lunchroom inside wanting lunch but they cannot have it.

I guess it is okay to have those kids then to go to the classroom for the second half of the education day in front of a teacher hungry, while the other half of the class are picking their teeth from the lunch that they are able to afford because the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is able to provide that for her children and I am able to provide it.

So I guess those of us that have, we are going to be okay. It is just those other folk out there making up beds, popping sheets in hotels and driving cabs around here, good luck to them.

I guess when faith-based organizations in my district and throughout this country are trying to do all they can to hold this thing together, providing after-school programs with parishioners, giving money to fill the gap that is no longer being filled because we have cut the local commitment in juvenile justice and prevention programs. When we say "prevention" we are talking about programs. We are talking about programs that help young children stay out of trouble, homework centers. All of those activities that we have put in Leave No Child Behind and will not fund those, Mr. Speaker. We will not fund those. I guess that is a dependency for after-school homework.

But guess what? We have a nice cozy jail cell if someone was to step out of line. So I think it is important for us to remember that this is very, very serious.

Now there was an amendment in committee by the Democrats that said that, okay, let us talk about the tax cuts so we can expose the real reason why we are going through this exercise. Let us talk about the tax cuts for the special interests and billionaires first. Let us bring that up first and make that a part of this budget and reflect it and put it out front so everyone can see it.

But the majority did not want that to happen because it just would have been too easy for the folks back home. So say, okay, you are raising fees on students, our future workforce, by \$5,000 apiece, to the tune of \$14 billion. And then you turn around and this particular industry is receiving a \$10 billion, what you call, "incentive," we call tax cut, even though they have record profits to go out and find oil off the coast of Florida. Yeah, that is the ticket. That is. And that is actually happening.

So that is why it is important that we come to this floor every time we get the opportunity, within the frame of the rules, Mr. Speaker, to share with the Members on the majority side that

we know what they are doing, and the American people know what they are doing, and that is why the American people see this Congress on the approval end at 35 percent. We did not do the poll. That is what the American people are saying. It is not only Democrats, it is Independents, Republicans and others.

So we are here to make sure that all Americans know exactly what is going on and let the chips fall where they may and make sure everyone understands and we have transparency in this process.

□ 1345

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. What we are here going to say is that the emperor truly does have not clothes. If you remember that story, everyone in the kingdom in that story refused to acknowledge that the emperor was buck naked because they were worried about the consequences. They wanted to make sure that nothing happened to them. Well, we are not afraid. We are not afraid.

It needs to be highlighted and underscored. What they are doing to the American people needs to be brought out, and we are saying do not believe us. This is not what KENDRICK MEEK and DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ are saying or TIM RYAN or any of the other Members that have come to this floor to share angst and concern.

We are saying look at the third party validators that we have saying the exact same thing. We are saying look at the religious leaders who are urging and who just yesterday came to the Congress to urge the congressional leadership not to put forth these drastic cuts that are going to hurt people.

This is from today's Washington Post. This is not a quotation from someone else. This is in the story on the budget cuts. It says, With so many controversial provisions, the House measure is forcing Republican leaders to scramble for support in what could be the most difficult vote of the year. Well, I would agree. This should be the most difficult vote of the year. When you are cutting people's food stamps, when you are cutting their children's ability to get free and reduced lunch, when you are cutting \$4.9 billion from child support programs that help people collect money from deadbeat dads, yeah, I would guess that is a tough vote. Lord, I would hope so.

It goes on to say, Some Republican moderates are balking at cuts to anti-poverty programs, especially in light of the \$70 billion tax cut that could come to a vote soon after the budget bill, more than wiping out that bill's deficit reduction.

Well, here it is. It is not what DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and KENDRICK MEEK are saying. The article describing the budget cuts, the reconciliation bill, specifically says that there is no deficit reduction in what they are doing. What they are doing is to try to preserve the tax cuts for the wealthy,

make sure that their right wing, that their right flank does not go absolutely ballistic, because that wing of the party does not care about taking care of people. They are trying to make sure they preserve what they have and what the upper echelon has.

Let us talk about because if you do not believe the Washington Post, you think it is paper that is off the mark, let us just go through what some of our religious leaders are saying. We are not talking about liberal religious leaders or progressive religious leaders. We are talking about mainstream religious leadership that came here yesterday and joined in prayer at the Capitol.

They included Reverend Dr. Bob Edgar, who is the general secretary of the National Council of Churches of the United States; Jim Wallis of Sojourners magazine; Rabbi David Saperstein of the Religious Action Center; and Eleanor Giddings Ivory of the Presbyterian Church. Let me go through a couple of things that they said in urging the Republican leadership not to do this, not to harm and cause harm to the people that this budget will affect.

Reverend Jim Wallis: "As this moral battle for the budget unfolds, I am calling on Members of Congress, some of whom make much out of their faith, to start some Bible studies before they cast votes to cut food stamps, Medicaid, child care and more that hurt the weakest in our Nation."

Rabbi David Saperstein: The budget reconciliation package with its \$50 billion in program cuts and \$70 billion tax cuts giveaway is morally unjustifiable.

Reverend Eleanor Giddings Ivory of the Presbyterian Church: I am here today to express concern for the Federal budget reconciliation packages under consideration in the House and the Senate. Our Nation is about to balance its budget on the backs of the poor. Is that a moral thing to do? Clearly the answer is, no, it is not.

Let me just tell you, I was so moved by Rabbi Saperstein's comments in their effort yesterday. He, as is the practice of many of our religious colleagues on both sides of the aisle but particularly because the Republican leadership and its Members like to use their faith so often to underscore how they have injected values into government, Rabbi Saperstein urged our colleagues and said that they ought to remember that the Bible urges us to "deal thy bread to the hungry," not "steal thy bread from the hungry." He asked us to remember Proverbs' stern warning: "Do not steal from the weak because he is weak and do not oppress the poor in the gate."

I could go on, but there have been many more than just the religious leaders that were here yesterday who have urged this Congress not to take these actions. It not only will harm people, cause grave harm for people who have already been on the brink, it will not improve anything. It does not reduce our deficit. It does not improve our economy. It only brings harm, and

I think if we are going to subscribe to anything it is the physician's oath. That should be something we live by, which is first do no harm. When we get here, we should commit to doing no harm, and it appears unfortunately as though the Republican leadership came here to do the opposite.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very evident that nowhere in this budget is it talking about cuts in tax breaks to special interests. There is nothing in here that says that we are going to make sure that we tell billionaires that we have some things that we need to do here in this government and we can no longer give them that tax break. We are not saying it to special interests, but we are saying it to those who cannot fight for themselves.

We are saying it to not only students, but we are saying to parents that if the majority side have their way, they need to go out and meet with their college fund adviser because you will be paying more for higher education so that your children will be able to be a part of this workforce or what is left of it and has not gone to China and other countries.

I think it is also important to understand that child support, like Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ said, has been cut in this budget, and now over on the Ways and Means on the committee side is \$8 billion as it relates to the cuts over 5 years. The cuts come where? Human services, child support and foster care.

So I want to warn States, including my State in Florida, I want to warn you, you are going to have to deal with enforcement of making sure that single moms are able to get money from deadbeat dads or vice versa. You are going to be responsible as it relates to kids that are orphans to find some sort of shelter when they have to go into a foster home environment because the Federal Government, we are not partners with you anymore because we are trying to clear the way so that we can keep our promise to billionaires and special interests here in Washington, D.C.

I want to also put the States on warning, every State, red, blue or purple, I am giving you forewarning that you are going to see the largest what we call devolution of taxation in the history of this country, where we back out of the responsibility of being a part of making sure that we have vibrant communities and making sure that we treat people like they are supposed to be treated because you are going to have to make the cuts because you have to balance. You have to balance your budget.

So what we hand down with the philosophy that if you are middle income in this country, if you are not a billionaire or a millionaire, good luck. Good luck on health care because we do not have health care, real health care here in the United States.

There is story after story about small businesses telling folks to go

sign up for Medicaid because they cannot afford to give them real health care. Sign up for Medicaid.

But guess what, I want to say this to the small businesses. There is a \$10 billion cut in this budget. So, guess what, that option is no longer going to be there if the Republican majority has their way. If they continue to have their way, it is okay for them to go into what is left of a poverty, if you want to call it, health care program out there for people that need health care to be able to make sure that they provide tax cuts, not for you, small business person, not for you, company of 100 or 200 people or company of 500 people, not for you, Republican, Democrat or Independent, but for the individuals that have the ear apparently of the majority at this particular time.

We know that this is the people's House, and I have said it before and I will say it again. It is supposed to be the people's House and we are the only body here in Congress, the Senate you can be appointed if it is in midterm, but only in the House of Representatives is it that you have to be elected. That is in every State, and no one can touch that. If a Member was to say I resign today or I am moving on to something or I am appointed to this position, you do not see someone here tomorrow. There is a special election set, and the local people in that district will vote to replace that individual that left Congress. So I think you could not get closer to the people of the United States than we should be here in the Congress, and I will tell you this, that I am very, very concerned about what is being done here in Washington, D.C., right now.

I am going to just show this quick chart because I showed it at the beginning, but I just want to keep reminding folks. Folks feel that, oh, they are alarmists. Some people walking around here in the Capitol, they are saying something and what is the problem. What is the problem? There is no problem. What are you talking about? Things are great. You know, I had lunch today, did you?

But when it comes down to security and financial security, 42 Presidents, and I am going to say it again and I am going to keep saying it, 42 Presidents, \$1.0 trillion loaned from foreign holdings, and this is from the U.S. Department of Treasury that we have gone to other countries to borrow money, World War I, World War II, you name it, Depression, all 42 Presidents, one President \$1.05 trillion in 4 years.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That is combined.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. All of these Presidents combined could not do as much as this administration has done as it relates to borrowing from foreign countries to support mainly tax cuts that we cannot afford for billionaires and millionaires and special interests. I could see if it was something where there was billions of dollars going into U.S. cities and to rural America to

build economic development, to be able to help farmers that are trying to compete with foreign countries, thanks to us, okay, or thanks to the majority.

I can see if we were going into schools and saying that we are going to be the leaders of the world in educating engineers, that we are going to have science and math and we are going to lead the world in education. I could see that.

I can see if we had real homeland security where our border would be protected and that we would have the enforcement officers out there with the tools that they need to make sure it is protected and have a process to be able to deal with the issue of illegal immigrations and even if they are in this country, I can see if those dollars went towards that.

I can see if we said we want to deal with energy with those dollars, Mr. Speaker, to be able to say that we want to pull back on our dependency on oil and that we will use alternative energy sources. I can see that.

But I do not see people coming to the floor and saying, well, on behalf of the economy, billionaires need another tax break, millionaires need another tax break, this special interest group with record profits, unprecedented history of these oil companies, that we need to give them additional billions of dollars in taxpayers' money to go out and do what they should be doing with their profits anyway. You get a small business that makes a profit, some of that goes towards a security fund and some of that goes towards what? Growing their business. No, no, no, not in this majority, no, no. You get the profit and then you come over here to the Congress and you get the taxpayer money to go out and do the things that you should be doing in the first place.

It does not make sense, Mr. Speaker, and I do not care who says different. I do not care if the chairman of the basket weaving committee was to come to this floor and say what is the problem. What is the problem? We have enough baskets. What are you complaining about. Well, there is a lot to complain about, and there is a lot to let the Members know and the American people know that we are willing to lead in the area of individuals who are not leading in right now on the majority side as it relates to energy, as it relates to making sure that we have a health care plan here, making sure prescription drugs are affordable for Americans, making sure that our men and women in Iraq have what they need.

□ 1400

And let me just mention something for a minute, since I mentioned Iraq. The bottom line is that on the majority side and the President you start saying, okay, let us talk about Iraq. All right, we had bad intelligence, and that is a big question right now. We do not know if the Congress was given bad intelligence or not, but there is very

little that is happening on that. And thanks to the Democrats in the Senate that pushed a—

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. If the gentleman will yield before we branch off to Iraq just for a second.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I am coming right back. I am not going into Iraq. This is an example.

That is fine that the Senate came together, three Democrats, three Republicans, who will come together with a report on the intelligence piece. Okay. Okay.

Do we have a strategy for success? Well, we do not have that answer. Do we have a strategy of when we will be able to have American men and women come back home? Well, you know, we are fighting a war against terror, a global war, and we have got to go after the terrorists. Okay. But what is our strategy? Well, we do not have one.

So we are spending billions and billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money in Iraq at this particular time. And it is not about the troops; it is about some other things that we are trying to accomplish.

What is the strategy? Well, there is no strategy, and why are you asking, by the way. Why are you asking what is the strategy?

I am on the Armed Services Committee, and folks say, do we have an exit strategy? Democrats and Republicans have asked that. And I want to say that on the minority, the majority of the minority of the members over there, in the majority, have asked that question, along with several members on the Democratic side, because we want to know exactly where we are going. Are we going to be in Iraq as long as there is a small insurgency?

So that is the issue when it comes down to oversight and governance and making sure that we do what we need to do. So I just wanted to mention that because the ideas that we have, the ideas as relates to pay-as-you-go, the ideas as relates to being energy efficient by 2010, 2012, those ideas cannot surface in this Congress because the majority has their foot on those ideas.

So when folks come to the floor and say what is the problem, I guarantee when that budget comes up next week, and there is talk on the other side of, I wish our friends on the Democratic side would join us in this budget resolution that is coming to the floor, well, I have to say this to the Republican majority: I hope that Republicans join you on it, because that seems to be a problem, Mr. Speaker.

Every time there is a major bill that comes to the floor and it is a 15-minute vote, that 15-minute vote turns into a 2-hour vote. Why does it turn into a 2-hour vote? Not because Members cannot make it from their offices to the floor. No, it boils down to whose arm can be twisted, who can be pushed into a corner, and who can be pushed into voting for an unjust budget to clear the way for special interests and for billionaires.

So, Mr. Speaker, if someone wants to impress the American people that the budget is so good, let us follow the House rules and do the vote in 15 minutes. Do the vote and do not have the Members standing here at 3 a.m. in the morning saying, well, Mr. Speaker, they said it was a 15-minute vote and we are now on 90 minutes. When are we closing the board?

I think the reason why the voting board was not closed, and probably will not be closed next week, is that as long as the majority is not getting their way, they are going to change the spirit of the rules of the House of Representatives, and that is the problem too.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You know, I have been seriously considering coming to the Chamber next Friday in my pajamas, given the track record of controversial votes, where they make their Members, the Republican leadership makes their Members puke blood in not allowing them to decide what to do, to stand on the courage of their convictions. They keep the board open, and we watch it light up like a Christmas tree up there, red to green, green to red. It is just unbelievable.

Sometimes I think the board is malfunctioning. Maybe it is not functioning. Maybe we should get an electrician in here. Maybe we should have the electrician check the wiring behind the Republican Members' names and their lights, because they do not seem to be able to pick one and have it stay there. Every time they have to cast a controversial vote, it goes from no to yes, then yes to no; or they do not appear to be able to turn their own light on for a very long time, because they cannot decide. Is it that they cannot decide?

I just want to make sure, because it is deeply concerning to me that they would not know when they came to the floor how to vote on a bill that is going to cut food stamps, that is going to cut financial aid, that cuts access to affordable energy, that allows drilling around the entire coastline of the United States of America where it is not currently allowed. So there has to be something wrong with the wiring.

Next week, I am going to be here in my pajamas and a teddy bear with a nice cup of coffee because we are really going to have to settle in for a long night. It is not going to be a normal 15-minute or a normal 5-minute vote, because I think the wiring under that board is going to go haywire next week. They are clearly not going to get their way right away because this is going to be a gut-wrenching angst-ridden vote. Woe to the Member on their side that does not vote how the leadership wants them to.

Sometimes when we talk in trillions and billions and millions it is a hard concept for people to understand. I know it is hard for me. A trillion is such a huge number. An \$8 trillion deficit is what we are in the middle of

right now. That is a huge number. I sometimes cannot understand how big that number is. It is also hard to understand what an \$844 million cut from the food stamp program is, or the kind of cuts they are going to be passing down in this budget reconciliation document that is going to affect affordable housing.

I want to show this picture. This picture is of me standing in the apartment of one of my constituents whose roof caved in on her during Hurricane Wilma. These are the people that, on top of what they have already gone through, on top of what they have already gone through, now we are going to cut the budget that funds the very programs that exist to help them.

There are people in dire straits in south Florida after Hurricane Wilma and in the gulf coast region after Katrina. There are people who before the hurricanes hit were in dire straits. This is what the problem really looks like for people. These people cannot live in homes like this because this home was condemned. Obviously, nobody can live in the apartment in this picture, and I wish that there was only one that looked like this in south Florida. This is the plight that we are putting people through.

Before we give out the Web site, I want to close by saying that we are in the middle of adding "C" after "C": with the culture of corruption, cronyism, and the lack of confidence that the American people have in their government, and now we have the coverup Congress. That is what came to light here this week. We have repeatedly asked for investigations, that this leadership stand up and do what is right. And Leader PELOSI has tried to get them to do that, and they have unanimously rejected that.

We are going to continue to come back to this floor and stand up for the American people, and I look forward to continuing this dialogue with my colleague.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Just to add to what I was saying before the gentleman made her statements, October 7 the board was open for 40 minutes to pass the "energy bill," as relates to home heating. Special interests were able to get their profits out of that. The board was open for 40 minutes, even though it was a 5-minute vote.

November 22, 2003, broke the record here in the House of Representatives by holding the vote open. It was originally set for 15 minutes but lasted over 3 hours into the middle of the night. It was obvious on the prescription drug bill that it was a failing bill, but it took 3 hours for the majority to get their way.

The reason why there are two dates on this, July 27 and 28, is because the board was left open, the voting board was left open for an hour, well past the 15-minute voting time on CAFTA, which actually passed by 227 to 215. So when the majority says I wish the Democrats would join us, I wish that

the Republicans would join the Republicans on it, because they know exactly what is not happening.

I want to give our Web site out here. It is 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. That is 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. We want to make sure that everyone knows exactly what is going on here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Florida, as well as the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), who joined us here today; and we will continue to work hard not only to bring fresh ideas to the floor but to make sure that we point out where the inequities are within our own institution.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE ROBERT W. NEY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable ROBERT W. NEY, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 4, 2005.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that my office has been served with a grand jury subpoena, issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and directed to the "Custodian of Records," for documents and testimony.

I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. NEY,
Member of Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 300

In the Senate of the United States, November 3, 2005.

Whereas Henry Ku'ualoha Giugni was born on January 11, 1925, in Honolulu, Hawai'i;

Whereas Henry Giugni served with distinction in the United States Army, after enlisting at the age of 16 after the attacks on Pearl Harbor, and served in combat at the Battle of Guadalcanal during World War II;

Whereas Henry Giugni began his service in the Senate in 1963 as Senior Executive Assistant and Chief of Staff to Senator Daniel K. Inouye;

Whereas Henry Giugni served as Sergeant-at-Arms from 1987 until 1990;

Whereas Henry Giugni was the first person of color and first Polynesian to be appointed to be the Sergeant-at-Arms;

Whereas Henry Giugni promoted minorities and women by appointing the first minority, an African American, to lead the Sergeant-at-Arms' Service Department, and was the first to assign women to the Capitol Police plain-clothes unit;

Whereas Henry Giugni's special interest in people with disabilities resulted in a major

expansion of the Special Services Office, which now conducts tours of the U.S. Capitol for the blind, deaf, and wheelchair-bound, and publishes Senate maps and documents in Braille;

Whereas in 2003, Henry Giugni received an Honorary Doctorate of Humane Letters for the University of Hawai'i at Hilo in recognition of his extraordinary contributions to Hawai'i and the Nation;

Whereas Henry Giugni carried Hawai'i's flag while marching with Dr. Martin Luther King for civil rights in Selma, Alabama;

Whereas Henry Giugni presided over the inauguration of President George H.W. Bush, and escorted numerous foreign dignitaries, including Nelson Mandela, Margaret Thatcher, and Vaclav Havel when they visited the United States Capitol; and

Whereas on November 3, 2005, Henry Giugni passed away at the age of 80; Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Henry Giugni.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of Henry Giugni.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1928a-1928d of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Senate Delegation to the Nato Parliamentary Assembly in Copenhagen, Denmark, November 11-14, 2005, during the One Hundred Ninth Congress:

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT).

The Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD).

The Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS).

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING).

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 107-273, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Antitrust Modernization Commission:

Makan Delrahim of the District of Columbia.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the body. We are at a time right now where literally the stakes of America lie in the balance. Our future is going to be determined by our actions today.

Many people often ask me exactly what is the difference between the two approaches, and I will tell you that there are significant differences between the Republican and Democrat approach in Congress. Dennis Prager, a

talk show host and author from California, has really summarized those very well; and I will quote from him, but these words express the beliefs of many.

The differences between this side of the aisle and that side of the aisle are important and substantial.

One party believes in American exceptionalism on a national stage, that the United States has better values than any other country. The other believes in the United Nations, the acceptance of all countries' values.

One party believes in universal morality, that is the ultimate good and evil that exists in society and the necessity to choose between them, and that that decision between good and evil should determine the international authority. The other believes the Universal law; that whatever the U.N. decides should be determining our international law.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that that is playing out right now in the United Nations, as we see the head of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, mired in corruption with his own son and with close allies of his in the bureaucracy indicted and involved, and yet we are not hearing one word about that corruption and that involvement from any of our friends on the other side of the aisle in this body.

One party believes that race is irrelevant. One party believes that race is the defining of the human being. I will tell you that race has no characteristic. Character has characteristics. And when we begin to understand that we judge people by their character and not by their race, we are going to be a better country for that.

One party believes in powerful government. One party believes in individual liberty.

One party believes in individual responsibility. One believes society is responsible for individual actions.

We often hear the words that poverty causes crime. If poverty causes crime, then affluence causes kindness. If you want to see that in play, you would look at the most heinous of the drug lords in central and South America, people who are rolling in billions of dollars and yet have an evil intent toward everyone around them and toward everyone in society.

I will tell you that poverty does not cause crime; character causes crime. If you do not have a certain level of income, you are determined to be morally retarded by our friends on the other side of the aisle. And I will tell you that that is one of the biggest insults we can give to people of low income.

One party believes that while compassion is important, standards are more important. One believes compassion is more important than standards. The only people held morally responsible today are white Christian males. In macro-life, society, standards must be more important than compassion. In your personal life, we allow compassion

to rule. But when we begin to deal with compassion from the government, someone is always disadvantaged.

□ 1415

One party believes the Boy Scouts are the greatest blessing in America. One believes they are a curse and working daily to undermine the capability of the Boy Scouts to deliver their message and their program.

One party standard bearer believes that the greatest threat to humanity is environmental degradation. One believes that the greatest threat is human evil.

One party believes in secular government. One party believe in secular society. There is a huge difference between a secular government and a secular society. Government without religion or society without religion, if we are without religion as a society, where do we get the moral values that will compel us to follow laws and to act within the bounds of human behavior?

One party believes that Judeo-Christian values and God are what makes society tick. One believes that all values in society are equal, and that is played out in the moral relativism that we see declaring that even in the United Nations we cannot get a definition of what a terrorist state is because all societies are deemed to be equal. They will not condemn any other society in the U.N., and I will tell the Members that that value plays out inside this country, also.

One party believes in the value of Europe. One party believes in the values of Texas. One party regards the Lone Ranger as a moral model. One regards the Lone Ranger as an arrogant unilateralist.

Mr. Speaker, we are faced in these times with extraordinary difficulties. I would remind this body that just as late as 1999 we began to experience tremendous economic difficulties in this country. They were brought on by the collapse of the dot com industry. That was an industry that had built up the prices of its stock so that stocks that had no product, they had no sales, they had no net income, those prices had escalated from zero and \$1 all the way to \$200 and \$300 per share. That was a fictional amount, but our economy experienced a surge in the late 1990s.

Then in 1999 and 2000, while President Clinton was still in office, we had the dot burst of the dot com bubble. That created a recession inside our economy that began to persist. We were just about to work our way out from underneath that economic burden when 9/11 came along. That shocked us again into deep recession.

Once again, the Bush administration, having inherited the dot com collapse, which collapsed before they came to office, and then faced with the economic pressures of the 9/11 catastrophe, fought its way back. And still we were about to come out from underneath those two deep shocks to our economy when we had companies like Global

Crossing, which defrauded the Nation out of millions and the chairman of the Democratic Party, on a small investment, made \$18 million.

That corporate culture of misleading and pulling money out of stocks and giving it to individuals, that Enron-Global-Crossing-WorldCom then created an even deeper shock into the economy because people began to pull their money out of the stock market and began to put their money into very safe investments but pulling it away from companies where they could grow and expand.

So those three deep shocks were facing this administration almost from the day that they took office, and still we did things as Republicans which caused the economy to turn around. We passed the individual tax cuts. The Governor of New Mexico, a widely respected Hispanic Democrat Governor of New Mexico, stated most clearly when he was lobbying for tax cuts inside the State, he said, and his words are very true, that tax cuts create jobs.

Now that is the question as we go in toward the end of this year, whether or not we are going to let ourselves understand the economic principles and try to achieve growth to where our kids continue to have jobs to go to or if we are going to listen to the other side and say that these tax cuts are just tax cuts for the wealthy. That is the discussion going on now. Do we want a vibrant, growing economy, or do we want to listen to our friends over here harangue about policies of which they appear to not have much understanding of? Who is going to win this economic struggle for the future of the country? That is the question that is involved right now.

I will tell the Members that if we are not dedicated to the principle of building this economic strength back into the economy, we are going to find after January 1, all the tax cuts were temporarily extending until January 1, and they roll out and become noneffective on January 1. If we do not do something about that, I will tell the Members that we are going to find the deep shocks into our economy that are going to penalize all of us.

We are finding, also, that the policies of our friends from decades of obstructing industries in this country that we are harvesting the benefits of those policies of obstructing. For instance, drilling. Are have constantly hearing from our friends that you will not drill here, you will not drill there, you will not drill anywhere. So today we have \$70 and we have got \$14 gas.

Now what does that mean? The \$14 gas is compared with normally \$2. One does not have to really understand gas much. Just think about the relationship between 2 and 14, and one will begin to understand the economics that face us. This winter, because of past policies, we are going to reap the benefits of those obstructions to drilling that our friends on the other side of the aisle have thrown up.

We have made decisions not to drill in ANWR, we have made decisions not to drill on the Outer Continental Shelf, and we have made decisions to not drill in the Rocky Mountain regions of the country where tremendous trillions of cubic feet of gas are available. And the losers are going to be the American public and the consumer.

But, long term, we are going to continue losing because our jobs are moving overseas. When we are paying \$14 for natural gas in this country and because gas is not easily transported, the pricing tends to be national in scale rather than international. We are paying \$14 in this country, and yet many of our friends around the world are paying under \$4. Some places pay as little as \$1.

One can imagine that if one is a plastics manufacturer here in this country or a chemical manufacturer or a fertilizer manufacturer that they are paying \$14 and they could locate a plant where they are paying \$1. Common sense and business sense will tell us that there is great incentive for people to go where the \$1 gas is, but, when they do that, they are going to take the jobs and the manufacturing facilities and they will never come back to this country because we will never be able to get our price down to where the foreign nations have it. They have such a low relative wage that we are never going to compete dollar for dollar. So once we allow those plants to move overseas, then we will have lost that segment of our economy.

I will tell the Members that that is where the real threat for America lies, in the loss of that economic structure, that economic base for this country.

The future of our children is at stake. Those of us who are baby boomers like myself, I think during the next 10 years we can see that slow deterioration of our economic base. But it is when it is dissipated that our children and grandchildren are going to reap the very sad rewards of policies that our friends on the other side of the aisle, with good intentions and good hearts, have foisted on the American public.

Today, the debate in this country is about the future of this country. President Bush and his administration have steadfastly moved us into pro-competitive, pro-business environments, and our friends here in Congress have constantly criticized that, have constantly thrown up roadblocks to that and have constantly had no suggestions of their own.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just close today by saying that this is a very important time in our Nation's history. We are fighting basically three deep struggles right now. We are fighting an economic struggle that is worldwide. The worldwide economy has taken traction. Jobs can be here or jobs can be in other countries with equal facility. Investment capital can move up and move to wherever those capitals would want to go. There are

absolutely no restrictions. The Internet makes it possible to move one's money literally overnight. So we have an economic struggle where we are competing with low-price, high-quality competition in our labor market.

So the economic challenge is one, but we are also facing a challenge of military circumstances. The war on terror is absolute. It will be fought. It is just a question of whether it will be fought in this country or in the homeland of the terrorists. For myself, I always vote to take the battle to the terrorists there.

We did not invite 9/11 into this country. It came without provocation and with no warning. We are either going to continue seeing that escalation of terrorist attacks inside this country or we are going to find that we will encounter the terrorists and defeat them on their own ground. And I will tell the Members that as long as people are willing to cut off the heads of individuals who are private, nonmilitary citizens, without provocation, that there is no negotiating with that kind of a person. It is a fight to the death, and the more terrorists that we kill and capture and put into prison, the more safe that our streets will be for the kids who are walking on the streets just intending to go to school on certain days.

So we have got the economic struggle going on. We have then the war on terror. But we also have a tremendous social struggle going on where we are trying to determine the values of this country.

Again, my introduction differentiated between the two parties and the approaches to the values. I am not saying that everyone in America agrees with our friends on the other side of the aisle, even if they are in the Democrat Party, but I will say that the leadership here in this Nation is willing to talk fiction and talk nonanswers and throw obstructions into the way of good, hard-nosed policies which guarantee our future, and for that they will be eternally accountable.

They talk about corruption, and yet they fail to mention that the only person in prison today is actually one of their members who came in in my class last year. Only one person. And yet they are sending phone messages and they are sending radio commercials, bank phone calls into many Republican districts saying you should give back that money. Theirs is the side with answers to give, and yet I never hear those questions about their own people. Their agenda is a political one. It is designed to gain back political power at the expense of the Nation. It is a day that they should not be proud of.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. KIND (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. OSBORNE (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. POE (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for today on account of a family medical emergency.

Mrs. EMERSON (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for today on account of illness.

Miss McMORRIS (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for today on account of business in her district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEFAZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SESSIONS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEWIS of California, for 5 minutes, November 7.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2744. An act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 7, 2005, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4971. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Red River, Mile Marker 73 to Mile Marker 76, in the vicinity of the #2 John Overton Lock and Dam [COTP New Orleans-04-042] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4972. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile Marker 11.8 to Mile Marker 12, West of the Harvey Lock, in the vicinity of Crown Point, LA [COTP New Orleans-04-043] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4973. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 95.0 to Mile Marker 96.0, Above Head of Passes, in the vicinity of Algiers Point, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-04-044] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4974. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Treasure Chest Casino, Lake Pontchartrain, Kenner, LA [COTP New Orleans-04-045] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4975. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Indian Beach, Lake Pontchartrain, Bonabel, LA [COTP New Orleans-04-046] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4976. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile 94.0 to Mile 96.0, in the vicinity of Aquarium of America's, New Orleans, LA, [COTP New Orleans-04-047] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4977. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile Marker 11.8 to Mile Marker 12, West of Harvey Lock, in the vicinity of Crown Point, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-001] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4978. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Inner Harbor Navigational Canal, 500 yards North and South of Mile Marker 1.7, in the vicinity of the Florida Avenue Bridge, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-002] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4979. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 0.0 to Mile Marker 5.0, in the vicinity of Cupits Gap, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-003] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4980. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; High Water, Lower Mississippi River Mile Marker 223 to Mile Marker 241, Baton Rouge, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-004] (RIN: 2115-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4981. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 115.0 to Mile Marker 119.0, in the vicinity of the Luling Bridge, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-005] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4982. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Head of Passes, Mile Marker 440 to Mile Marker 435, in the vicinity of the Highway 80 Bridge, Vicksburg, MS [COTP New Orleans-05-006] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4983. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Miles 93.0 to 96.0, Above Head of Passes, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-007] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4984. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Harvey Canal, Mile Marker 3.0 to Mile Marker 2.6 West of Harvey Lock, in the vicinity of the LaPalco Bridge, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-008] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4985. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Above Head of Passes, Mile Marker 440 to Mile Marker 435, in the vicinity of the Highway 80 Bridge, Vicksburg, MS [COTP New Orleans-05-009] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4986. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Above Head of Passes, Mile Marker 1.0 to Mile Marker 3.0, extending the entire width of the river, Pilotown, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-010] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4987. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Lincoln, NE [Docket No. FAA-2005-21707; Airspace Docket No. [05-ACE-22] received October 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4988. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Service of Process on Foreign Manufacturers and Importers [Docket No. NHTSA-2005-21972] (RIN: 2127-AJ69) received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4989. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Seat Belt Assemblies [Docket No. NHTSA 2005-22052] (RIN: 2127-AI38) received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4990. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Golovin, AK [Docket No. FAA-2005-21448; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-16] received October 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4991. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aeropatiele Model ATR42-500 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20406; Directorate Identifier 2002-NM-242-AD; Amendment 39-14270; AD 2005-19-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4992. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777-200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20475; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-157-AD; Amendment 39-14250; AD 2005-18-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4993. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-110P1 and EMB-110P2 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-21302; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-189-AD; Amendment 39-14267; AD 2005-19-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4994. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model ERJ 170 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-21345; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-005-AD; Amendment 39-14266; AD 2005-19-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4995. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A340-200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-

2005-20405; Directorate Identifier 2002-NM-243-AD; Amendment 39-14269; AD 2005-19-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4996. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-600, -700, -700C, -800, and -900 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2004-19750; Directorate Identifier 2003-NM-192-AD; Amendment 39-14264; AD 2005-18-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4997. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAe Systems (Operations) Limited Model ATP Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20404; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-018-AD; Amendment 39-14268; AD 2005-19-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4998. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Trent 875, 877, 884, 884B, 892, 892B, and 895 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2001-NE-17-AD; Amendment 39-14265; AD 2005-01-15R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4999. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Model 390 Premier 1 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-21239; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-27-AD; Amendment 39-14263; AD 2005-18-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5000. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Models 1900, 1900C, 1900C (C-12J), and 1900D Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22332; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-46-AD; Amendment 39-14262; AD 2005-18-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5001. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Model 390 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-21410; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-31-AD; Amendment 39-14272; AD 2005-19-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5002. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100, 747-100B, 747-100B SUD, 747-200B, 747-200C, 747-200F, 747-300, 747SR, and 747SP Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22413; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-167-AD; Amendment 39-14271; AD 2005-19-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2830. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than November 18, 2005.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota (for himself and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota):

H.R. 4231. A bill to ensure that any affordable housing assistance program of Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac allows participation by nonprofit organizations that engage in voter registration activities required under State law; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. STARK, Ms. WATERS, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 4232. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to deploy United States Armed Forces to Iraq; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota (for himself and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD):

H.R. 4233. A bill to allow a custodial parent a refundable credit for unpaid child support payments and to require a parent who is chronically delinquent in child support to include the amount of the unpaid obligation in gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4234. A bill to provide for the relief, recovery, and expansion of small business concerns affected by Hurricane Katrina through technical assistance, access to capital, and expanded Federal contracting opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself and Mr. BEAUPREZ):

H.R. 4235. A bill to designate certain National Forest System lands in the Pike and San Isabel National Forests and certain lands in the Royal Gorge Resource Area of the Bureau of Land Management in the State of Colorado as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CHOCOLA (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELLER, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BEAUPREZ, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 4236. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain farming business machinery and equipment as 5-year property for purposes of depreciation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 4237. A bill to ensure that local governments can function in the case of a declared emergency or major disaster; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCCAUL of Texas (for himself, Mr. REYES, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 4238. A bill to provide for enhanced border security enforcement and detention facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. OTTER, Mr. BOREN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 4239. A bill to provide the Department of Justice the necessary authority to apprehend, prosecute, and convict individuals committing animal enterprise terror; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota:

H.J. Res. 71. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to authorize the President to reduce or disapprove any appropriation in any bill presented by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H. Con. Res. 290. Concurrent resolution honoring the goals and ideals of National Nurse Practitioners Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RENZI (for himself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. COLE of Oklahoma):

H. Con. Res. 291. Concurrent resolution honoring the service of American Indians in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H. Res. 534. A resolution recognizing the importance and credibility of an independent Iraqi judiciary in the formation of a new and democratic Iraq; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H. Res. 535. A resolution honoring the life, legacy, and example of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin on the tenth anniversary of his death; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TANCREDI, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. CARSON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. WATERS):

H. Res. 536. A resolution expressing condolences to the people and Government of Nigeria for the loss of life suffered in the crash of

a Nigerian passenger jet on October 22 and the tragic death of Stella Obasanjo, wife of Nigerian President Olusegun Obasanjo, at a hospital in Spain on October 23, 2005; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 282: Mrs. TAUSCHER and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 376: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 501: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 602: Mr. GIBBONS.
H.R. 657: Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 690: Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 703: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 759: Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 944: Mr. SIMMONS.
H.R. 972: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 998: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1108: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 1141: Mr. SAXTON.
H.R. 1227: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1246: Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 1333: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1337: Ms. HARRIS.
H.R. 1405: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 1415: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1424: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1578: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FEENEY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 1597: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1704: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1707: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LEACH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KIND, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LEE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. McNULTY.
H.R. 2206: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2328: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 2335: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 2356: Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LOBRONDO, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 2378: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 2386: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2391: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 2642: Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 2671: Mr. BARROW and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2717: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2725: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2792: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2872: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. Schmidt, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. RENZI, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 2962: Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 3095: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 3111: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 3127: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. DELAULO, and Mr. SHAW.
H.R. 3137: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 3145: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KUHLE of New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORTUÑO, and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.
H.R. 3151: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 3248: Ms. HERSETH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RENZI, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3307: Ms. HOOLEY.
H.R. 3333: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 3373: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 3478: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BARROW, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 3492: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 3559: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 3604: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3630: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3774: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 3778: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 3804: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 3858: Mr. WOLF and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 3882: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 3907: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 3917: Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 3936: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. OLVER, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. DELAULO, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 3960: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 3979: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3998: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 4034: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 4047: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 4052: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 4081: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 4092: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARROW, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR, Mr. FORD, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KIND, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEXLER, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 4096: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. FORD, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Mrs. DRAKE.

H.R. 4099: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 4110: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 4145: Mr. COOPER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. REYES, and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4156: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 4179: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 4188: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 4214: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 4222: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H. Con. Res. 173: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H. Con. Res. 190: Mr. JINDAL.

H. Con. Res. 197: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H. Con. Res. 210: Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H. Con. Res. 260: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 273: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BARROW, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 284: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BERMAN, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. HYDE.

H. Con. Res. 289: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H. Res. 123: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Res. 196: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 411: Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 466: Ms. WATERS.

H. Res. 479: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. WEXLER.

H. Res. 487: Ms. HARRIS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mrs. DRAKE.

H. Res. 489: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. FARR, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. FERGUSON.

H. Res. 495: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H. Res. 500: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 504: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H. Res. 505: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FARR, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. SABO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. OWENS.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3304: Mr. KUHLE of New York.

H.R. 4011: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.